

Duplicate discard



LIBRARY
OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN THE
DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

A GIFT FROM

Miss Bessie Small

No.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

The Bohlen Lectures 1887

THE

AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK

ITS PRINCIPLES AND THE LAW
OF ITS USE

BY THE

REV. J. F. GARRISON, A.M., M.D., D.D.,

MOORHEAD PROFESSOR OF LITURGICS, CANON LAW AND ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY IN
THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL IN PHILADELPHIA

DELIVERED IN THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY TRINITY, PHILA-
DELPHIA, IN FEBRUARY, 1887

PHILADELPHIA

PORTER & COATES

1887

G
7/21/37

Miss Small

The John Bohlen Lectureship.

JOHN BOHLEN, who died in this city on the 26th day of April, 1874, bequeathed to trustees a fund of One Hundred Thousand Dollars, to be distributed to religious and charitable objects in accordance with the well-known wishes of the testator.

By a deed of trust, executed June 2d, 1875, the trustees under the will of Mr. Bohlen transferred and paid over to "The Rector, Church Wardens, and Vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia," in trust, a sum of money for certain designated purposes, out of which fund the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars was set apart for the endowment of THE JOHN BOHLEN LECTURESHIP, upon the following terms and conditions:—

The money shall be invested in good, substantial and safe securities, and held in trust for a fund to be called The John Bohlen Lectureship, and the income shall be applied annually to the payment of a qualified person, whether clergyman or layman, for the delivery and publication of at least one hundred copies of two or more lecture sermons. These lectures shall be delivered at such time and place, in the city of Philadelphia, as the persons nominated to appoint the lecturer shall from time to time determine, giving at least six months' notice to the person appointed to deliver the same, when the same may conveniently be done, and in no

case selecting the same person as lecturer a second time within a period of five years. The payment shall be made to said lecturer, after the lectures have been printed and received by the trustees, of all the income for the year derived from said fund, after defraying the expense of printing the lectures and the other incidental expenses attending the same.

The subject of such lectures shall be such as is within the terms set forth in the will of the Rev. John Bampton, for the delivery of what are known as the "Bampton Lectures," at Oxford, or any other subject distinctively connected with or relating to the Christian Religion.

The lecturer shall be appointed annually in the month of May, or as soon thereafter as can conveniently be done, by the persons who, for the time being, shall hold the offices of Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese in which is the Church of the Holy Trinity; the Rector of said Church; the Professor of Biblical Learning, the Professor of Systematic Divinity, and the Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia.

In case either of said offices are vacant the others may nominate the lecturer.

Under this trust the Rev. J. F. Garrison, D.D., of Camden, N. J., was appointed to deliver the lectures for the year 1887.

CAMDEN, Ash Wednesday, 1887.

LECTURES ON THE BOHLEN FOUNDATION.

Delivered in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia.

1877. By REV. ALEXANDER H. VINTON, D.D. *Inaugural Series.*
1878. By RT. REV. F. D. HUNTINGTON, D.D. *The Fitness of Christianity to Man.*
1879. By REV. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D. *The Influence of Jesus.*
1880. By THE VY. REV. DEAN HOWSON, D.D. *The Evidential Value of the Acts of the Apostles.*
1881. By RT. REV. T. U. DUDLEY, D.D. *The Church's Need.*
1882. By RT. REV. S. S. HARRIS, D.D., LL.D. *The Relation of Christianity to Civil Society.*
1883. By REV. A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D. *The Continuity of Christian Thought*
1887. By REV. JOSEPH F. GARRISON, D.D. *The American Prayer Book.*

Preface.

CERTAIN principles are held as fundamental by the Church, in England and America, with reference to the "Prayer Book."

1. The order and the forms of worship of the early ages of the Church were derived from the Apostles, or in accordance with their instructions, hence were to be for all time the types and tests by which all modes of organization, doctrines, and offices of public service should be tried and judged. These have been called Scriptural, Apostolic, Primitive or Catholic.

2. Any wide departure from these, much more rejection of any of their important elements involved, would inevitably manifest itself in serious evils of doctrine, or of life, or both. Therefore, if such changes had at any time been made, that portion of the Church which desired to preserve its Scriptural and Catholic character must abandon them and return in all their essentials to the original ideas, and, so far as possible, also to the early forms.

3. The latter centuries of the Middle Ages had introduced into the Churches of Western Europe numerous such errors and perversions, known according to the point of view from which they were regarded as Mediæval, Roman, Priestly or Sacerdotal. Hence there was need of a reform in these particulars, and of a corresponding restoration of the primitive teachings and

forms where these had been widely or injuriously departed from or misinterpreted.

4. The Church of England, in the exercise of the rightful authority which, as a national and organic portion of the Church, it had always possessed and used, in the sixteenth century revised its offices of worship and standards of doctrine, and such "abuses which, not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected," were omitted from the forms then set forth, while others that "pertained to edification" were embodied in the services which were thus established.

5. The offices so prepared were, in all their important features, a restoration of the teachings of the Apostles, as well as the forms in which that teaching had been expressed and maintained in all the early ages of the Church.

6. The book in which these are contained is, in its latest form, that which was "set forth" in 1662, the law of doctrine and worship of the Church of England.

7. The American Church maintains essentially the same position with reference to its Prayer Book of 1789, both as to the principles of its formation and the nature of its authority; hence our offices hold the same relation to the early forms as do the English, although in some points, notably the "Invocation of the Holy Spirit" in the Communion office, and the treatment of private confession and absolution, they are more near the early types than the book of the Church of England. In all essential matters, however, these two branches of the Church are at one.

The purpose of the following Lectures is to present, as clearly and as fully as the limits of such a course will permit, the leading features of the primitive services of the Church and the doctrines connected with them in the early ages, to trace some of the more important and injurious of the sacerdotal or mediæval departures from, and perversions of, these Catholic truths and forms, and to indicate the manner in which our offices have restored the essentials of the Apostolic and Scriptural teachings of the primitive Church. In connection with this a sketch has also been given of the outlines of the ritual law by which our branch of the Church has endeavored to preserve these teachings from perversion in the future, and to ensure (as the Master's high commission bids) that in her offices and ministrations she shall teach what He has commanded her "until He come again."

Contents.

LECTURE I.

	PAGE.
The General Principles of the Prayer Book given on its Title-page	19
The Sacraments and Rites it administers are those of "the Church"	22
The Catholic Continuity and Authority of the American Church .	25
"According to the Use," means that it is the Ritual Law of this Church	38
Origin and Significance of the Name "Protestant Episcopal" . .	43

LECTURE II.

"Common Prayers," etc. Prayers, etc., in which the People have a part with the Minister	51
The Liturgy or Holy Communion in the Primitive Church . . .	54
The Chief Service of the First Day of the Week, and only then .	55
Prayers for the Holy Spirit an essential element in all early Liturgies	58
Testimony of the Fathers on the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Consecration	65
The Discourses of our Lord—John xiv-xvii—show the same relation	67
The Consecration in the early Liturgies through Prayer, not by the uttering of the Words of the Priest	69
The early Liturgies required all present to Communicate	70
Difference of the Roman Mass from the early Liturgies as to the means and effects of Consecration	73
The Liturgies of the Western (Latin) Churches changed from the early Forms	74
Introduction into the West of the Theory of Transubstantiation . .	76
Mode in which the Real Presence is effected according to the Roman (Mediæval) Theory	77
The Effects of Consecration (on the Roman Theory) while Christ was in the Tomb	79

Introduction of the Worship of the Sacrament into the Western Church	80
Introduction of the Elevation of the Host for Worship, of the Sacring Bell, etc.	81
Communion of the Laity in "one kind" only. Theological Significance of this	82
The Body of Christ taken (on the Roman Theory) by the Wicked, by an Animal, etc.	83
Effects (in the Sacerdotal System) of the Sacrifice of the Mass, on the dead	84
The English Order for the Holy Communion a return to the Principles of the early Liturgies	86
These Principles more fully stated in the Catechism and Articles	87
The Repudiation by the American Standards of the Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharist	88
The American Liturgy has fully restored the early Forms, by the insertion of the Oblation and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in its Prayer of Consecration	89

LECTURE III.

The Daily Morning and Evening Services of the early Church . .	96
Character and Contents of these Offices	98
The Relation of the Daily Services to the Sacramental Offices . .	101
Changes in the Daily Offices and the Institution of the Mediæval "Hours"	107
Character and Contents of the Breviary	108
Restoration of the Primitive System of Daily Prayers by the English Reformers	111
The Penitential Introduction of the English Daily Services a Primitive feature of these Offices	114
The mode of Confession and its use in the Primitive Church . .	117
To hear Confession and give Absolution not allowed the Priests in the early Church	119
Gradual Development of the Middle Age System of Confession, etc.	121
Absolution not given in the positive form until the Twelfth Century	125
Confession not made Universal and Obligatory until A.D. 1215 .	125

CONTENTS.

15

Growth of the System of Commutation in Penance	127
Extension of the power of Excommunication and Absolution to the Dead	136
Connection of this with the Doctrine of Purgatory	138
Necessity in this System of Priestly Absolution for Salvation . .	140
Rejection of the Middle Age System of Confession by the English Church	141
Manner in which Confession is presented in the English Offices . .	143
The American Prayer Book removes all traces of the Mediæval System from its Offices	148

LECTURE IV.

The Prayer Book of the American Church is its Law of Ritual . .	150
Fallacy and Uncatholic Character of the Claim of "Liberty of Ritual"	152
Constitutional Obligations to conform to the Ritual in the Prayer Book	155
Personal Obligations of the Clergy under their Ordination Promises	160
The Bishop the only Officer who has Authority in matters of Ritual	163
Our Clergy have no right to borrow from the English Rituals, whether of the present or of the past	165
The Ante-Reformation Uses of the English Church abolished, for- bidden and destroyed	170
The only Legal Ritual in England is that of the Prayer Book of 1662	175
The General Principles of Rubrical Interpretation and Use . . .	180

LECTURE V.

The Liturgy the Chief Organ of the "Teaching Church"	190
Hence not to be altered by the Officiating Minister	196
This never allowed in any age or portion of the Church	197
Especial danger of its Introduction in the present age	203
Omissions and Manipulations of the Liturgy in the interest of False Teaching	206
Interest of the Laity in preserving the Stability and Uniformity of the Liturgy	208

LECTURES.

LECTURE I.

THE TITLE-PAGE OF THE AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK—
THE CATHOLICITY OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH: ITS
AUTHORITY, ITS NAME.

THE subject of this course of lectures is "The American Prayer Book:" its Leading Principles and the Law of its Use.

The term "Prayer Book" is used here as the popular and convenient designation of the entire volume of the offices and standards of our Church, which contains not only the "Book of Common Prayer," with its various services for public worship and orders for the administration of the Sacraments, but also "The Articles of Religion," "The Ordinal" of the ministry, and such other "Rites and Ceremonies of the Church" as have been "established and set forth," to be used in the "Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

This volume is indeed, and in a sense peculiar to itself, what it is called, "The Prayer Book" of the people. It is their constant companion and guide in every

public service of the Church. Its pages are before their eyes, its words are on their lips, its collects, litany and psalms are heard by them in every act of worship in the congregation, and oftentimes when alone or in the private service with the gathered household. They are familiar with its forms and language in the repeated ministration of the Sacraments, and all the important epochs in man's life are hallowed by its sacred associations from the cradle to the grave. Its prayers and anthems are among the earliest lessons the child has learned beside his mother's knee, and its thoughts and influences are prized increasingly the more as years bring more of reverence and higher wisdom with the snows of age.

But wide and important as are these relations of the Prayer Book to the worship of the people, it has other uses, and comes to us with other claims than to be merely a collection, however admirable, of the prayers and praises and Scripture readings appointed for the services of the Church.

It is also, and in connection often with its forms of worship, the authoritative standard of the doctrines of "this Church," the law for the ministrations of the clergy in all its appointed offices, and the teacher of the people, through its services and by its various ordinances, in all the essential elements of Christian truth and Christian living.

This combination of the doctrine, worship and law of the Church in a single volume, and placing it in the hands alike of people and clergy, gives the Prayer Book a unique character and place among the works known in other portions of the Church, and calls those

who desire to use it with full profit to a thoughtful consideration of the principles on which its leading offices are based, and of the relations of its appointed services to the instruction and worship of the people.

It would require a separate examination of each of the several offices of the Prayer Book to present these in their special character and import; but there are certain general principles on the nature, authority and worship of the Church and its relations to the Holy Scriptures which must be regarded as fundamental elements in the constitution of this Church, and in the offices it has established for the ministration of its public services. These should be clearly understood as the basis of any right appreciation of the claims or meaning of the book, or of the Church through which it comes to us.

Several of the most important of these principles have been incorporated into the title-page of our Prayer Book, and are presented there as distinctive features of the services and formularies which the book contains, and of the Church, in whose name and by whose authority they have been established and set forth for our use, so that a consideration of the several portions of the title-page will, at the same time, bring to our notice the chief contents of the book itself, and present to us the leading principles and relations of its more important offices.

The form of the title-page to the American Prayer Book is the same as that of the last revision of the English book, made in 1662, except the substitution in the American title of the name "Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" for "The

Church of England," and the mention in the English book of "The Ordinal," which does not occur in ours. This form is in all essentials the same also as was given in the first Prayer Book in the English language, that which was "set forth" in 1549, and is generally known as the "1st Book of Edward VI." The second revision of the English book, made in 1552, departed in this, as in many other important particulars, from its predecessor, and made considerable changes in its title. The form of the title-page of 1552, as most of its alterations, passed down with no noticeable variation until the revision of 1662, also known as "The Annexed Book,"¹ which was prepared and set forth by the two Convocations and Parliament after the return of Charles II, but in this revision the original title-page, probably under the influence of Bishop Cosin, was restored, and it has so remained ever since.

The first attempts toward an organization of the Church in the United States after the Revolution, on a national basis, were two so-called General Conventions held in 1785 and 1786. The constitutions which were suggested by these, respectively, and the Prayer Book proposed and published under the authority of the former, all allude to the "*title*" by which the book referred to should be known, and hence this must have received more or less careful consideration on each of these occasions. In the Convention of 1789, by which our present Constitution and Prayer Book were finally

¹ It was so called because in the Act of Parliament, by which it was made a law of the realm, it was spoken of as "the Book annexed and joyned to this present Act." XIV. Carol II, § 2.

“prepared” and “established,” the “title-page” of the latter was a subject of distinct and specific legislation.

On the last day of the session (October 16th, 1789) provision was made to unite the several offices, which had been separately adopted, in one volume, and to ‘ratify’ and set this forth as “The Liturgy” of the Church in the United States. The House of Bishops, in view of this, had on the preceding afternoon¹ (October 15th) “ORIGINATED and proposed to the House “of Deputies alterations of the title-page, a form of “ratification of the Book of Common Prayer,” etc. And on the following day the Journal of the House of Deputies states,² “The House of Bishops proposed a “title-page to the Book of Common Prayer, which was “read and passed.” And later in this same session “the form of ratification was agreed to,” of course including in this the title which had previously been adopted by both Houses as the name of the book. Thus, while the American title-page is in its form the same as the English, it was not an unconsidered transfer of this to our work, but has the significance of a deliberate expression by the General Convention of the terms by which it intended the Prayer Book of the Church in the United States should be described and known.

As such we will consider some of its more important features.

First. It states that the Sacraments and other Di-

¹ “Journals of General Conventions,” etc., by Wm. Stevens Perry, D.D. 3 vols. 1879. Vol. I, 121.

² Journals, etc. Vol. I, 110.

vine services which it provides for are those of "THE CHURCH." The Prayer Book thus, at the outset, defines its own position, and the source and authority of its offices and ministrations. It is "The Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments; and other Rites and Ceremonies of *The Church*."

It is not a collection of ordinances and rules for the use of some local institution or temporary society. It is no mere arrangement of devout and proper forms for public worship and service. Its Sacraments, ministry and services did not originate with the founders of the American Church in 1789. They are not the product of the Reformation era, nor do we receive them solely as belonging to our honored mother, the great Church of England. On the contrary, they come to us on the authority of the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, and we have and use them because our Church is a living member of this same universal body of the Lord. Hence it is from the Church that they derive their origin; it is to the Church we owe their preservation. They were ordained under the commission Christ gave His Church at its foundation, and through and by the Church they have been ministered to all the ages. As such they are received by us and truly named in our Prayer Book, "The Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of THE CHURCH."

The immediate source whence we derived these holy ordinances, and the general forms in which they are administered, is the same from which came also our organic unity with the Catholic and Apostolic Church, that is, the Church of England, for through her we trace back in a valid and unbroken line our continuity

of Orders, Sacraments, Worship and Holy Scriptures to the age and authority of the Apostles.

But while the chief features of our sacramental and other offices are those of the English Church, we have adapted these to our needs by such modifications as seemed to be required, and which, in our rightful authority as a branch of the universal Church, we were fully qualified to make.

In the primitive Constitution of the Church (and until the dominance of Rome had overthrown the apostolic organization of the Church throughout the most of Western Europe), each organic portion of the Church had and exercised, what England and all the Eastern Churches still retain, full and complete power over all the services they employed; and each in the way provided by its special usages or laws, modified and directed its own offices, as it thought best or its peculiar needs demanded.

In Western Europe the liturgies were translated from the Greek, which was the original language of all of them, into the Latin tongue, while certain portions of the Eastern Church also rendered theirs into their own vernacular.

Besides these adaptations of the language to the different sections of the Church, there were many other changes, as the theology and other tendencies of succeeding centuries changed, in various particulars of nearly every service, both in form and contents. These were especially numerous and marked in the offices and teaching of the Western portion of the Church. But while the alterations thus made had certain traits in common, as being in each age the expression of "the

spirit of the time," yet for many centuries each organic portion of the Church was wholly free to make whatever changes it deemed needful, and only such as it desired, by its own act and on its own uncontrolled authority.

The Church of England, in especial, maintained with jealous care this right of ordering her own services in the way of her own appointment, and through all the varied phases of her history, Briton, Saxon, Norman, English, down to the Reformation, she never allowed any other authority to interfere with her offices of public service, than that which from her foundation had been charged with this high duty. It had belonged of inherent right to her own bishops and her own convocations from the apostolic days, and it was so preserved by her through all the ages after.

The supremacy of Rome attained gradually during the Middle Ages to the control of the forms of worship in most of the Western Continental Churches, but all her efforts to induce or compel the English people to conform their liturgies to her order were unsuccessful until the reign of Mary, and even then were yielded to but partially and under protest.

The English Church and people have thus always had and exercised the full right to mould their services as they willed, and in entire independence on the Roman Bishop, or any other authority whatsoever outside themselves. "So wide, indeed, was the discrepancy" between their uses and the other Churches of the West that Archdeacon Freeman says, "It may safely be affirmed that no Roman or Continental priest can possibly, for many ages before the Reformation, have

“officiated at an English altar.” (*Principles of Divine Worship*. Vol. 2. Introduction, p. 84.)

When the Church was first planted in this island its inhabitants were the Britons, a Celtic people akin in race to the Irish, the Scotch and some of the tribes in Gaul. The precise date of its founding is not certain, but it was very early. And it was known all over Christian Europe, for many generations before a Saxon or an Engle had set foot in Britain, as “a Church distinguished by its missions¹ and with a long roll of saints.”

The Church of the Britons had relations with all the other Celtic communities, and they formed together a group or family of churches which were alike among themselves, but differed in several matters concerning forms of worship, ceremonies and some questions of polity very considerably from the usages of Rome. Considered as a distinct body this Celtic Church was “Catholic in doctrine and practice,” “having, as Warren “says, a liturgy of its own, its own translation of the “Bible, its own monastic rule, its own cycle for the “calculating of Easter, and presenting both internal “and external evidence of a complete autonomy. When “it did come in contact, which, however, rarely hap- “pened in those early ages, with the Bishop of Rome, “it ‘allowed him a high post of honor, though second “to that of Jerusalem, the place of our Lord’s Resurrec- “tion,’ but claimed to deal with him from the inde- “pendent standpoint of an equal.”

¹ “The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church,” by F. E. Warren, B.D., 1881, pp. 45, 46, 38.

The Church in Britain thus had, from almost or quite the apostolic age, a ritual and service of its own, and the spirit of independence which inspired it then was never, even when it seemed most in peril, lost wholly by the Church of England.

The invasions of the Engles and Saxons into Britain (A.D. 450) resulted in the virtual extirpation of its old inhabitants from the whole east part of the island, and they and their Church were driven back into Wales and Cornwall, while the portion of the country occupied by the new settlers was reduced to barbarism and heathendom.

In 596 the Bishop of Rome, Gregory I, sent a monk, Augustine, with forty companions to found a Christian mission among these pagan peoples. He seems to have known little or nothing about the Britons or their Church, but in the natural pride of a representative of the first Bishop in the Western Church, and a friend of the Saxon King by whom he had been favorably received, he assumed a superiority over the British bishops which they indignantly refused to grant. The liturgy and ritual of the two Churches were different, as they had always been, in many details of expression and ceremonial, but the "use" of the Britons was regarded by Augustine as Catholic in its essentials, and the only points on which he demanded actual change were, in their time of keeping Easter and the forms of their baptismal office. But the Britons insisted that their customs were primitive and apostolic, and they would neither abandon their own usages, nor recognize any authority in Augustine or the Roman Bishop to impose foreign services or forms on them. The course pursued by

Augustine in matters apart from his personal relations seems to have been intended to make the worship of his churches as acceptable to the British portion of the island as he thought possible, and it appears very evident that the offices of the Saxon Church, as prepared by him, were shaped in many things after those of the kindred Celtic Church in Gaul. Hence they were, in these respects, nearer the Briton than the Roman formulæ, and from these early offices have doubtless come most of the distinctive features which marked the services of the English Church through all the after-periods of her history, and gave them an impress they have kept even until now.

The success which attended the missions of Augustine at the first was not of long duration;¹ a reaction toward paganism set in for a time, much of the ground he gained was lost, and under his immediate successors the Roman missions were confined almost wholly to a part of Kent. But in this period the interest of the Irish and Scotch portions of the Celtic Church had been aroused for the conversion of the Engles and Saxons, and their missionaries founded churches and introduced the Celtic liturgy and usages into most of the nations from the Thames to the Scottish border. For a considerable period the two Churches continued in a position of entire separation, mostly in bitter antagonism, but after a time the Roman missionaries were again received with favor by the chief Saxon kings, and the Church, under their rule, became the established form of religion in most of these kingdoms;

¹ "Hardwicke's History of the Church in the Middle Ages," pp. 6-16.
"The Making of England," by Richard Henry Green, chap. 6.

and in 673, after repeated and vehement discussions, and from political even more than ecclesiastical considerations, the two branches of the Church, the Celtic and the Saxon, within the limits of the English territory, agreed upon a settlement of their contentions, and the common life of the two thus united became henceforth the one "Church of England."

The exact character of the services, as finally adopted in the Anglo-Saxon Churches, has been much disputed, and little is known certainly concerning them; but it is probable, as Mr. Maskell says,¹ that "the bishops of "the several dioceses into which England was gradually divided, *exercised their power to enjoin within the "limits of their respective jurisdictions rites and ceremonies and prayers.*" "The Eucharistic offices may, "therefore, have been for many years distinguished "from each other by very important differences—"doubtless they all preserved the essentials of the "service—but the differences continued until the civil "subordination of the whole land under one head introduced a greater sameness of practice."

We meet with a few instances during this Saxon period of the Church of the regulation of certain matters connected with the liturgy by the general synods of the provinces. There were also some endeavors, which seem to have produced no actual impression, to subordinate the services to the Roman "use"; but as they had been framed at the first to meet the special needs and disposition of the Saxon Church, so its bishops

¹ "The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," by William Maskell, M.A. 3d Edition, 1882, pp. 61-63.

continued to maintain them essentially as they had been thus formed until the Norman Conquest.

When William the Conqueror had become fairly seated on his English throne (A.D. 1066), he instituted the policy of filling all the episcopal sees, whenever an occasion offered or could be made, with bishops from some of the Churches on the Continent. This was continued during his life, and also, by his successors, for a considerable time after him, and as the Papal authority was acknowledged by the Continental clergy in a sense never admitted among the Saxons, the Church of England came under the Roman influence to an extent that had been heretofore unknown.

But notwithstanding this increase of Papal power through the foreign clergy, the independence of the English Crown and Church from undue interference by the Pope was guarded very jealously by the determination of the King to be supreme in every province of his dominions.¹ Even in a matter so peculiarly spirit-

¹ Mr. Lingard says, "History of England," Vol. II, chap. 1: "William would not permit the authority of any particular pontiff to be acknowledged within his dominions without his previous approbation; he directed that all letters issued from the Court of Rome should, on their arrival, be submitted to the royal inspection. Without the royal license he would not permit the decision of National or Provincial Church Synods to be carried into effect. And to the demand for homage to the Pope he returned an absolute refusal. He had never promised it himself, his predecessors had never performed it, nor did he know any other ground on which it could be claimed with justice."

Mr. E. A. Freeman ("The Norman Conquest," Vol. IV, p. 297), after summing up William's course in similar terms, adds, "All of these (Acts of William) became part and parcel of the law of England. The supremacy established by him was essentially the same as the supremacy which was contended for by Henry II, and finally established by Henry VIII."

ual as the services of the Church, the Roman pontiff, however high his claims to be its spiritual head, was never permitted to exercise any controlling authority in England. And instead of displacing the old Saxon forms by others in conformity with those of Rome, as had been done with the national offices in well nigh every other country of Western Europe, the ancient "uses" appear to have been left in the main undisturbed for some time, or only slight changes were introduced by individual bishops, which attracted little notice. The first really important or successful modification of the previous offices was made about twenty years after the Conquest in 1085, by Osmund, the Bishop of Salisbury, or, as it then was called, Sarum.

The body of services prepared by him was not so different from those familiar to the people as to arouse any violent opposition, and yet, in some points, was more akin to those set forth by Rome than the old Saxon offices.

This collection, known as the "Use of Sarum," was favorably regarded by a number of the bishops in the province of Canterbury, and was introduced in place of the existing services into their several dioceses. But it was by no means universally adopted. Bishops of other portions of the Church prepared formulæ of the same general character, but varying in details, for their own dioceses; these also were employed by such of the bishops as preferred them. And we find accordingly "uses" of York, of Bangor, of Hereford, and others, so that the "Sarum use" was never the authoritative or even generally adopted form of the whole English Church, nor was it ever, as a whole, imposed

by synodic action on all the dioceses even in the Convocation of Canterbury.¹

The sources whence these various "uses" severally came is not known, nor does it matter by whom they were prepared. In their essentials they all were, as those they displaced had been, varieties of the same primitive liturgic form which was given to "The Church" at the beginning, and the authority for employing any special modification of this was that the bishop of the diocese had adopted it, by whomsoever it might have been suggested or prepared, and made it the appointed law of service in his diocese. In any point on which the Convocation of either province had taken action, that act was binding on all the bishops in its jurisdiction; but in all other respects the services of "The Church" in every diocese in England were what its bishop adopted as its "use," and thereby established as its law and the law of all its clergy.

The long centuries of barbarian invasions and settlements in Western Europe, and the influences growing out of these, had brought into the Church a host of doctrinal perversions and superstitious ideas and

¹ Archdeacon Freeman, Vol. II, p. 106, says, it is true, that: "On March 3d, 1541, by a regular Act of the Convocation of Canterbury, the ancient use of Sarum was made obligatory on the clergy of that province." But Dixon ("History of the Church of England") affirms, on the other hand, "This order would appear to have concerned the clergy alone, and the performance of their private devotions." And he adds in a note, "The essence of it lies in the words '*in horis suis canonicis dicendis*.'" The fact seems thus to be that the Order of Convocation referred only to the recitation by the priests, of their daily portions of the breviary, and not to those parts of the Sarum use employed in the public service of the Church.

practices, which culminated by producing in the sixteenth century an almost universal feeling among devout and thinking men in England, as on the Continent, of the necessity for a removal of these injurious evils and excrescences, and a return, so far as possible, to the Catholic doctrines and primitive forms of the Scriptural and Apostolic Church. This influence pervaded a large part of the English people and clergy from an early period of the reign of Henry VIII, and prepared them for the Reformation that was to follow; but during the life of this king the movement toward reform, whether in doctrine¹ or mode of worship, made very little public advance in the Church of England. Almost the only concern Henry VIII had in any matter connected with the Reformation was that he broke the English Church and realm wholly and forever loose from the power which the Bishop of Rome had gradually acquired over both,² but to which he had no right save that of assumption, and which, in the early periods of their history, had no existence at all. Hence, so long as Henry VIII lived there were no changes of any importance made from the existing doctrines of the Church, and excepting a prohibition to repeat the name of the Pope in any of the public prayers, and an order of Convocation to read the Scriptures in English at certain of the services, there was very little

¹ "Henry VIII never forgot that he was defender of the faith, nor does he seem ever to have gone in this region further in the direction of change than the more enlightened popes and cardinals of his own age would have gone."—Bishop Stubbs' *Lectures*, p. 259.

² "He (Henry VIII) may be said to have died a Romanist in all points but the Pope."—Trevor's "Doctrines of the Holy Eucharist," p. 388.

alteration in the forms of worship, and the old offices continued until his death (A.D. 1547) as they had been during many previous centuries.

The refusal of the King and Church of England to submit any longer to the authority claimed by the Roman Bishop in no way excluded them from the Church Catholic; his power had grown up through centuries of persistent encroachments on ancient rights, and favored by the peculiar conditions of those ages. Yet it had not been acquired without repeated and embittered struggles.

A series of royal acts and statutes¹ of parliament, extending from William the Conqueror on down, had opposed it as injurious to the liberties of the English realm, and had restrained within very narrow limits the exercise of many of its most important claims, or, under heavy penalties prohibited them altogether; and it was only the final culmination of this long conflict when, in the reign of Henry VIII, by the concurring acts of King, Parliament and Convocation the accumulated weight and evil of all this chafing domination

¹ Parliament, in the reign of Richard II, declared "That the crown of England ought not, in anything touching the regality, to be submitted to the Bishop of Rome, nor the laws of this realm by him frustrated and defeated at his will, to the perpetual destruction of the King and his sovereignty."

The statutes known by the names "Præmunire" and "Provisors" were enacted in accordance with these principles. These forbade appeals to the Pope, the promulgation of Papal bulls, excommunications, etc., the appointment by the Pope to English benefices and other like assumptions of authority. And as they were evaded or found ineffective, they were from time to time reinforced and re-enacted, and thus given a permanent place in the national legislation of England.

was cast off, and the English Church asserted at all points her independent place as an organic national branch of the Catholic Church, the same in all essentials after as before this rejection of a supremacy which the English nation had always protested against and regarded as a usurpation.

One of the matters in which the Church of England had always maintained her independence was, as we have already shown, the preparation and control of her offices of worship, changing and ordering them from time to time, according to her own ideas and by such means as she approved. A disposition to simplify and rearrange certain of the existing services had taken form early in the reign of Henry VIII. A series of revisions in this direction was begun in 1516, and in the year immediately following the Sarum Breviary and Missal were both thus improved.¹ Later on, several movements were proposed in Convocation looking toward a reformation of portions of the service, but none of these led to any considerable result.

The first act in which a general change was definitely inaugurated was the appointment, in 1542,² of a Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, by whom "all Mass books, antiphonars, portuasses, etc., in the Church of England should be "newly examined, corrected, reformed."

This Committee did not report during the life of

¹ Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service." Vol. 2, Introduction, p. 102.

² Freeman, *ut. sup.*, p. 107, says it was "a committee of both Houses," but "Lathbury on Convocation," p. 130, asserts "The clergy declined to act, so the business was left to the bishops."

Henry, but shortly after the accession of Edward VI.¹ "The Lower House (in 1547) petition the Upper that "the performance of the bishops and others who, by "order of Convocation, have spent some time in reviewing and correcting the offices of Divine service, might "be laid before the House."

A partial report only was made in response to this request, but in 1548 a Committee of the Convocation, much larger than the first, was appointed by the King to carry out this work more fully. They reported, in this same year, a form in English to be added to the Latin Mass, for the Communion in both kinds of the laity, and in 1549 completed their task by presenting to the Church a full revision of its ancient offices.² In this, as required by the needs and convictions of the time, all of these offices which the Church wished to retain were condensed, purified from corruptions and superstitions, simplified and rendered into the language of the people. Thus the old services, again modified and adapted to the present conditions of the people, were gathered into a single volume, and set forth as the "Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of The Church, after the Use of the Church of England."

This revision was in no sense a new set of services; they were not the creation of a late and innovating age; it was simply a restoring of the ancient forms,

¹ Freeman, *ut. sup.*, p. 109; "Lathbury on Convocation," p. 137.

² "It was not a new thing that was designed. From high antiquity the reformation of the rites of the Church was continual."—"History of the Church of England," by Richard Watson Dixon. 3 vols. Vol. II, p. 535.

which had become intermixed with errors and superstitions, to the simplicity and truth of primitive antiquity. And as the Church of England had continued in unbroken union with the Church Catholic, and preserved through all the centuries her rightful authority¹ as a portion of that Church, she now exercised it as she often had before; and under the changed conditions of her present state established, as she deemed advisable, her form of ministering the "Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of *The Church*."

The volume containing the "Services of the Church," thus reformed and adopted as the "use" of the Church of England, is known as "The Prayer Book of 1549," or "The First Book of Edward VI." Subsequent revisions in 1552, 1559, 1604 and 1662 have made some changes in certain details of its offices, but these were only modifications of the great work which was then first presented in the English language to the Church of England; and the principles of the relation of its services to "The Church," on which the present Prayer Book rests, are the same as those on which the first Book of Edward VI was prepared, and which it inherited as an inalienable right from all the England of the past—a right precisely the same as that exercised by Augustine and Osmund, and the authors of all the other "uses" in the Church of England from its earliest founders.

The latest of the English revisions was in 1662,

¹ "The Catholic independence of England, which was attested by its old 'uses,' was older than they, and had subsisted from the first."—Dixon, *ut. sup.*, Vol. II, p. 543.

accompanied since by the addition of some permissive Rubrics providing for greater flexibility in using certain of the offices.

The revision of 1662, and also the subsequent modifications, were, like the Book of 1549, first prepared and adopted by the Church in its Convocations, and then, with the royal approval, enacted as statute laws by Parliament, hence they are, in fact, the work of the Church through its legal representatives, the civil authority only adding its authority to what the Church itself had already approved. Accordingly, as the work of the Church, accepted and enforced by the civil authority, the English Prayer Book of to-day is the true and valid representative of the Divine services which were given by the apostolic founders of the English Church, and which that Church has defended so bravely and successfully from its very origin until now.

As the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has derived its Orders and holds its historical continuity with the Church of the Apostles through the Church of England, what has been said of the English services is equally true of those of the Church in the United States.

Before the Revolution of 1776 the churches in the Colonies of North America had used the English offices precisely as if they were in the mother country; but when the change in the political relations of the two nations constrained the churches in the several American States to unite and organize themselves as a National Church, this had, of course, the same control of its own Ritual which originally, and of inherent right,

belonged to every organic portion of the Church Catholic, and which the English Church, through all the phases of her history, had preserved so carefully. Accordingly, the Church in the United States, as the act of its first National Convention in 1789, established as its "use" such forms of worship and other acts of public service as seemed advisable. Hence these, like the English offices from which they chiefly were derived, are rightly called, upon their title-page, "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of THE CHURCH."

The second point of note on the title-page is, that the services contained in the book are "according to the USE of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America." "The use" is something very different in liturgics from "usages." "Usages" are simply the customs belonging to a parish or a community, incidental, local, in general the growth of time, and seldom obligatory except under especial conditions. "The use" of a diocese or church, on the contrary, is a law, the legal, authoritative form according to which its offices and services must be performed.

John Johnson¹ expresses its meaning when he says of Osmund, Bishop of Sarum, "he contrived a new use "for his Church; that is, he ascertained all the Rubrics "which were before not determinate enough; he adjusted and settled the series, the pomp and the ceremonies of Divine worship that were before left to

¹ "A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England," by John Johnson, M.A. 2 vols. Vol. I, p. 17.

"the discretion of those that officiated, which created "confusion and multiformity in the Church." And Maskell, speaking of some who contend that "the use" applied to the music only,¹ asserts "of the uses" of Sarum or Hereford, etc., "the (musical) notation may or may not be contained in them;" "in many office-books it is almost always omitted;" "the variations which constitute the use" are "the different prayers, "different arrangements of them and different ceremonies to be observed in the administration of the Sacraments." Hence "the use of the Church in the United States" is the law, according to which, both as to their words and the accompanying ceremonies, all its appointed services must be conducted.

The employment of the word in this sense probably came from one of the early and fundamental principles of the law of worship in the Church.

The primitive liturgies were evidently all derived from one common conception, and all framed after one general form; but in the embodiment of these for practical use they varied considerably in different portions of the Church, both in the arrangement of their several parts and in the language they employed. These special forms were given to the different Churches by their respective founders or early teachers, and were regarded by each Church as a precious legacy, to be preserved and handed down, in all essentials, as it had been received from them.

¹ "The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," by William Maskell, M.A., 3d Edition, p. 11. "The first Common Prayer Book of King Edward was not aimed at the abolition of varieties of music, but of a variety of prayers and rites and ceremonies. This last object was thoroughly effected. A diversity of singing, nevertheless, continued," etc.

The charge of thus guarding the Liturgy and of making any minor alterations, if such were needed or desired, belonged everywhere and always to the Bishop of each several diocese, and at first to him alone.¹

At a somewhat later period the bishops of each nation or province became organized into a regular association, known as its Synod, Council or Convocation. If any matter relating to the services of that district, of general concern, needed regulation, this body directed the order that should be observed, and this became the law in every diocese, and in each church under its jurisdiction, while in all things connected with ritual, not thus acted upon by the superior body, the Bishop of the diocese remained, as he had been from the beginning, the judge and decisive authority for the churches and clergy under his charge.

For the first two centuries, in the opinion of most Church historians, none of the liturgies, still less the rules for their performance, were reduced to writing. The words were taught to the student as part of his preparation for the work of the ministry, and were repeated by the minister in his service entirely from memory. In order to ensure correctness and uniform-

¹ There is no principle of ritual law more universally admitted by all competent Liturgists than this; to cite authorities would be to quote from every writer of any note who has made Liturgies a study. Two—one of an older and one of the present time—will answer for the whole. Van Espen says, "*Novae ceremoniae nullae recipiantur sine Episcopi judicio.*" In Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Judgments," p. 72.

And Probst yet more forcibly asserts, "In den ersten Jahrhunderten konnte sich am aller wenigsten ein Privatmann mit Abfassung einer Liturgie beschäftigen, da Alles was den Gottesdienst betraf, den Bischöfen reservirt war."—"Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte," p. 6.

ity in the conduct of these important offices, each presbyter was required to go once or twice every year to the Bishop¹ of his diocese, and perform in his presence all the appointed services of the Church, that his errors might be corrected and he receive instruction how the Ritual should be properly conducted.

And as it was presumed that the most accurate and careful use of all the offices would be exemplified in the church of the chief Bishop of the province, it was in many provinces ordered by Canon that the mode of conducting services in all its churches should be the same as in the church of their Metropolitan.

The forms of worship thus appointed "to be used" by bishops or the synods (according to the circumstances) constituted the law of worship of their province or diocese; and from the conditions of the earlier ages of the Church, which have been referred to, they came very naturally to be known in ecclesiastical language as "The Use of a Diocese," or, "The Use of a Province or a Nation."

In some portions of the Church the bishops retained their primitive power over the "use" of their dioceses for many centuries, in others the Synod of the province assumed, from a comparatively early period, a gen-

¹ "Dictionary Christ. Antiquities." "Ordo," p. 1521. "Sacramentary," p. 1829.

"History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain," by T. E. Bridgett (Romanist), Vol. I, p. 180, "In England, once at least, often twice in a year, each priest was obliged to attend the Episcopal Synod, bringing the sacerdotal vestments and whatever else was necessary to the celebration of the Mass, that his manner of performing the service might be approved."

eral supervision of all the services within its jurisdiction. As the policy of Rome grasped more and more at universal supremacy, her Popes sought, as an indispensable means to that end, to obtain control of all the services of those portions of the Church which came within their influence. Most of the national and local Churches in Western Europe surrendered soon or late to these requirements, and discarding, some after long struggles and with great reluctance, their ancient offices, adopted the "use" of Rome. This the English Church, as we have seen already, never did. Through all the varied phases of its history down to the Reformation, the Church in England preserved in this regard what Dixon calls¹ its "Catholic independence," its bishops maintained and exercised their primitive authority to make whatever "use" for their respective dioceses they preferred. In matters of such importance as required it, one or the other Convocation would occasionally issue a general order, which thenceforth became a part of all the "uses" in the several dioceses in that province. In the sixteenth century, as the condition of the age and Church then called for such a change, these ancient "uses" were "transmuted into the English Prayer Book;" and in the exercise of the same "Catholic independence" which had marked all the past, this was established and adopted as the one common "use" of all "The Church of England," and as such,

¹ "History of the Church of England," Vol. II, p. 542. What he says of the general polity of the English Church is eminently true of this special feature of it (Vol. III, p. 361): "The English Churches possessed and exercised from the very beginning the right of making laws for themselves, and acquired from their own councils and the ordinances of their own prelates a body of ecclesiastical laws."

in the words of Mr. Dixon, holds "the standard of English uniformity against the uniformity of Trent."

It is in this same sense and interpreted by this same History that the offices in our Prayer Book are declared to be "according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America;" that is, "the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church" are herein set forth, both as to words and ceremonial, as "this Church hath received the same." And this is the law according to which every bishop, presbyter or deacon is bound to minister them, or see that they are ministered, and he can know no other.

Another important feature of the title-page is the name of that branch of the Church whose services and laws of worship are "set forth" within. This is "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

The association of the word Protestant with the English portion of the Church, and the fact implied in it, both come to us from the mother country. If there be any one thing by which the people and the Church of England have been distinguished from the rest of Western Europe, from the beginning of the claims of Roman supremacy, it has been that of *protesting* against this usurpation, and asserting their independence, ecclesiastical and national, of all external jurisdiction and authority. The reformation of the sixteenth century simply terminated decisively and forever the issues of these long centuries of struggle; and the Church of England became henceforth the type to the Christian world of a Church, catholic in

descent, in faith, in form, in orders, and Protestant against all that sought to transform Catholicity into Romanism, and the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, into submission to a power that was not ordained of God. Hence, both as an embodiment of the history of the past and an assertion of the same position of the English Church to-day, the term Protestant may rightly and wisely be applied to her. And it expresses now, to use the words of Justice Phillimore, "as the constitution of Clarendon and the statutes of Premunire and of Provisors had expressed before the Reformation, the independence and national existence of the Church of England and her distinct position from the Church of Rome."

But not only is the term applicable as a reminder of this important historical feature of the Church of England, it is associated with it in many ways by actual and legal use. "The English sovereign at his coronation swears to maintain the Protestant reformed religion established by law." "The crown" of England is always "to descend in the Protestant line." The old (now repealed) statutes of the Union of Great Britain and Ireland enacted that "the Churches of England and Ireland, as now established by law, be united in one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called the "United Church of England and Ireland."¹

¹ The term was also applied by Parliament to the Moravian Church in an Act passed about the middle of the eighteenth century, granting relief to certain of its members who had removed to England. It is called "an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church, which had been countenanced and relieved by the Kings of England, his Majesty's (George "II) predecessors."—Encyclopædia Britannica, 8th Edition. "Bohemian Brethren."

With such antecedents in England the term would be one most likely to occur spontaneously to those who were active in the work of organizing a Church deriving its existence from this source, as a national, independent Church in the States of America. The suggestion that any one could be ashamed of the name "Protestant" would have been heard with surprise, not unmingled with contempt, by the great majority of Churchmen of all schools in this nation. They had not yet been taught to despise the Reformers, who, by their bravery unto death, had secured to England and to them liberty of thought and freedom of manhood, and with a learning and wisdom that have not been surpassed in any age or portion of the Church, restored the Church of England to its primitive purity of doctrine and apostolicity of form. Nor had they yet so forgotten the history of the past as to flout the Reformation which made it possible for the English Church to perpetuate the true principles of the Catholic ages, instead of being dragged in the train of Rome to the Trentism which buried the Catholic faith under the modern creed of Pius IV, and the Vaticanism which forever closed for the Roman communion the mouth of the Church Catholic, and in its stead left only a Papacy, which abandoned the claim, grand though false, that as a *Church* it was infallible, for the miserable substitute of submission to the dicta of a Bishop of Rome, infallible and "irreformable by the Church."

The facts connected with the employment of "Protestant Episcopal" as the official title of our branch of the Church Catholic, all show that it was not adopted in any mere casual or accidental way, but was the

result of deliberate purpose and understanding; that it was the natural expression of the sentiment of this Church at that time, and that it was intended to convey a distinctive principle of its character to all after time.

Before the war of the American Revolution was fairly ended, the future of the Church in the United States engaged the attention of many thoughtful persons on both sides of the ocean. In 1782 Rev. Dr. George Berkeley,¹ son of the celebrated Bishop of Cloyne, wrote to a Scotch clergyman, Rev. Dr. Skinner, afterward a bishop in that Church, suggesting whether "this be not a time peculiarly favorable to the introduction of the *Protestant Episcopate* on the footing of "universal toleration," and "that a most important good "may ere long be derived to the suffering and nearly "neglected sons of Protestant Episcopacy on the other "side of the Atlantic from the suffering Church of "Scotland." Some time after this, when Dr. Skinner had become a bishop in the Scotch Church, Mr. Berkeley again writes to him, "Can any proper persons be found who would convey the great blessing of the Protestant Episcopate from the Church of Scotland to the Protestant Episcopal worshipers in America,"² "for Papish prelacy hath found its way into the transatlantic world." And later on, when the Scotch were considering the case of Rev. Dr. Seabury, Bishop Kilgour, the Primus of Scotland, who was subsequently the principal in his consecration, expresses his hearty concur-

¹ "Perry's Journals of General Convention," from 1785 to 1835, Vol. III, p. 218.

² "Perry's Journals," Vol. III, pp. 218, 223, 305.

rence in the proposal for introducing a Protestant Episcopacy into America. The same language was also used in speaking of the attitude of the English bishops toward the American Church. The Rev. Dr. Murray, of London, says to Rev. Dr. White in 1786: "The archbishops and bishops will do everything they can toward the enlargement of Protestant Episcopacy," etc.

The conception of a "Protestant Episcopal Church," which was thus urged by the friends of the American Church in both Scotland and England, was also during this same period recognized by the Church in this country in almost all the movements which were being made, both for its diocesan and its national organization.

1. It was adopted in a number of the States as the name and corporate title of their Church before the establishment of the Constitution and Prayer Book of the national organization. The declaration of the fundamental rights, etc., of the Church in Maryland, (1783),¹ begins, "We, the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland (heretofore denominated the Church of England, as by law established," etc.).

The act of association of the churches of Pennsylvania "determines that the said clergy and congregations shall be called and known by the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania." The same terms formed part of the title of the Church in Virginia, New York, New Jersey and several others of the States.

2. The first of the preliminary General Conventions,

¹ "Perry's Journals," Vol. III, pp. 23, 41.

that of 1785, on its opening passed at once a resolve,¹ "That a committee * * * draft an Ecclesiastical Constitution for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America." This document, when presented, and as agreed to, began, "WHEREAS, The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is become independent," etc. The same title occurs five times in the body of the Constitution. In Article IV, the proposed American Prayer Book is spoken of as "The Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," and in Article X it is ordered "no one shall be ordained or permitted to officiate in this Church until he have subscribed a declaration 'to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, etc.,'" and by our present Constitution all who come to be ordained or who wish to be enrolled in our ministry must subscribe a promise of conformity to our Church as described by the specific title, "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States."

3. The letter to the English archbishops, requesting them to give us the Episcopal Order, was "from the Clergy and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." In the concordat which accompanied this request, the General Convention, in the 6th Article, recommend "That the bishops "may be called the Rt. Rev. A. B., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of C. D., and as "bishop may have no other title." And in compliance with this recommendation of the Convention, the English bishops consecrated Drs. White and Provoost

¹ "Perry's Journals," Vol. I, p. 21.

as bishops of "The Protestant Episcopal Church" in their respective states.

4. And finally, as we have shown already, the title-page of the Prayer Book, of which this name forms an essential portion, was proposed, discussed and adopted by the deliberate action of both Houses of the Convention of 1789. And the organic Constitution adopted by this Convention, and by which our Prayer Book itself was established, describes the Church, whose fundamental law it is, in at least four of its most important articles, by the name and title of "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

Thus, from its fitness to express the Protestant characteristics of the Mother Church of England in the past, and at the same time as the name deliberately chosen by the founders of the National Organization of the Church in the United States to express their desire to perpetuate that spirit in the new world, the presence of "Protestant Episcopal" is fully justified both on the title-page of the Prayer Book of "the Church in the United States," and as the constitutional description of the character and position of that Church.

For while, on the one hand, we declare that we have and minister in their Catholic completeness "The Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of THE CHURCH;" on the other, the name "Protestant Episcopal" will never lose its propriety and significance until the Church of Rome shall abandon its claim of infallible and absolute dominion over all the Churches and Christians on earth, and the Bishop of Rome be content to receive only the honor and deference due to the first Bishop in Western Christendom, which no one would then care to protest against or deny.

There is still a fourth declaration on the title-page that calls for our notice. In this, the Book is stated to be "The Book of COMMON Prayer and ADMINISTRATION of the Sacraments," etc. In the terms "Common" and "Administration," there is an intended expression of the relation of the people to the Sacraments and other services of the Church, and of the corresponding functions and ministrations of the clergy. As such, these words involve some very important questions of Christian doctrine and life.

The other statements of the title-page have referred mainly to the historical and legal relations of the book, but this will concern more properly the contents and practical use of the offices themselves; and as the consideration of these will be entered upon in the succeeding lecture, the expressions last quoted can be treated more satisfactorily in connection with the subjects of that lecture.

LECTURE II.

THE PRIMITIVE LITURGIES—THE ROMAN MASS—THE
COMMUNION OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

THE statement that this is "The Book of COMMON Prayer and ADMINISTRATION of the Sacraments," etc., etc., which is the fourth and last of the points to be noted on the title-page, can be understood in its full significance only in connection with other important features of the offices referred to in the expression itself. Hence we can give here merely the general principles involved in the use of the terms employed.

The phrase "Common Prayer"¹ has sometimes been taken to mean the ordinary, daily prayer "of the whole congregation on ordinary occasions, "whereas the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies are used by a part only of the congregation "and on particular occasions." But it was placed on the title-page of the Prayer Book, and connected with "The Administration of the Sacraments," etc., with a deeper significance than this.

The design of the English Church in translating her old offices of worship into the popular language, and putting them into the hands of the people as well as

¹ "Shepherd on the Common Prayer," p. 1.

the minister, was to restore to the people their right and ancient part in the services of the Church, which, during the Middle Ages, had passed almost wholly into offices "said" by the priest, and to have both ministers and congregation become again sharers together in the prayers that were offered, and the Sacraments that were to be ministered.

The public devotions of the Church had, under the sacerdotal system of the mediæval period, come to be mainly services performed by the priest for the people, acts in which they had little or no part save to be present, and to have prayers or sacrifices offered for them by an authorized priesthood.

But the people were now, as in the early ages of the Church, once more to have prayers in their own mother tongue, which they themselves were to pray with the minister, a worship in which every individual was to join with voice and understanding, and which was thus to be the "Common Prayer" of the whole Church as one, the prayers of the congregation equally as the praying of the priest.

So, too, of the Sacraments. The Holy Eucharist was presented in the Middle Ages almost wholly as a vicarious sacrifice offered on behalf of those looking on, a bare priestly function "celebrated" before them, and available solely as performed in their stead by "a Catholic priest."

But this, too, was restored in the Liturgy of the Reformation to its Scriptural and primitive use as "a Holy Communion." The people were again, as in the Divine institution, and for many centuries after, whenever present at the Sacrament, to be partakers with the

minister "of His body broken and His precious blood shed for them," as He had commanded to be done forever in remembrance of Him.

In both these vital restorations the American Church has followed her great English ancestor, and has returned to "the truth once for all delivered to the saints." She has made her daily offices of worship "The Common Prayer" of the Church, and she presents the Holy Eucharist, as *in its very essence*, a common act, a joint participation of both the minister and the "faithful." And "this Church," at one in this with the Church of England, knows nothing of a "celebration" of "the Lord's Supper" by a priest without an "administration" to the people, and a "Holy Communion" through its reception by those present who are entitled to partake.

The terms "Common Prayer" and "Administration of the Sacraments" on our title-page thus indicate the protest of the "Church in the United States" against the system of mechanical and priestly theology, which had become dominant in the Western Church in the centuries preceding the Reformation, and our adherence to the Scriptural and Catholic principles which are set forth in the gospels and apostolic writings, and embodied in the liturgies and "ancient authors" of the early Church.

As Mr. Green has admirably expressed it in his *History of the English People*,¹ "The name Common" "given to the Prayer Book marked its real import. "The theory of worship which prevailed through

¹ Green's "History of the English People," Vol. II, p. 226.

“mediæval Christendom, the belief that the worshiper
“assisted only at rites wrought for him by priestly
“hands, at a sacrifice wrought through priestly inter-
“vention, at the offering of praise and prayer by
“priestly lips, was now set at naught. The laity, as it
“has been picturesquely said, were called up into the
“chancel; the act of worship, devotion, became a ‘com-
“mon prayer’ of the whole body of worshipers, the
“Mass became a ‘communion’ of the whole Christian
“fellowship.”

Proceeding now from the general principles set forth
in the title-page of our Prayer Book to a more direct
consideration of the contents of the book itself, we begin
with that service¹ which, in all ages of the Church, has
been esteemed its central and chief act of public wor-
ship, “The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s
Supper or Holy Communion,” or, as it has been called
from the very earliest ages of the Church, “The
Liturgy.”

The command of our Blessed Lord, “This do in re-
membrance of me,” and the accompanying precept of
St. Paul, “As often as ye eat this bread and drink this
cup ye proclaim the Lord’s death till he come,” were
recognized from the very beginning as essential ele-
ments of the service and life of the Church.

Both the description given in the Acts of the Apostles
of the fervid zeal of the Christian community in the
Pentecostal days, that those who were baptized “con-

¹ This service was generally called in the earlier ages “The Eucha-
rist,” or “The Liturgy,” sometimes “The Breaking of Bread.” Its
name in the English and American Churches is “The Lord’s Supper,”
or “The Holy Communion.” The Romanists call it “The Mass.”

tinued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching, and in fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and the prayers," and the earliest accounts we have of the Church, after the Apostolic writings, show that the principal service of the first day of the week, or the Sunday, was always connected with the Holy Communion or was a Liturgy. That very ancient and invaluable record which has been recently discovered, and which goes back into the Apostolic age itself, known as "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," gives as one of its injunctions to those who seek to keep 'The Way of Life,' "On the Lord's Day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks (eucharistate) after confessing your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure." And Justin Martyr, in his Apology for Christianity, addressed to "the Emperor, the Sacred Senate and the whole people of Rome," at a date probably some few years later, says, "On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets are read, * * * then the president verbally instructs and exhorts. * * * After this we all rise and pray, and when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayers and thanksgivings; and the people assent, saying amen; and there is a distribution to each and a participation of that over which thanks had been given."

But while the Liturgy was thus in its primitive use the chief public service of each Lord's Day, it is almost equally certain that at this period, it was seldom or never performed on any other day of the week. It was in its very essence a specially festal service, and was

connected vitally with the thought and commemoration of the Resurrection of our Lord as the consummation of the work wrought in His death ; hence it had a peculiar relation to the first day of the week as that which was always associated with the remembrance of this great event, and found its appropriate use and place in giving a distinctive significance to the worship and service of that special day.

Of the fact that the Eucharist was thus limited in the early Church to the first day of the week, Pelliccia, a distinguished Roman Catholic authority, speaks without any qualification. He says,¹ "Our ancestors, in ancient times, celebrated Mass only once in the week, *i. e.*, on each successive Lord's Day, according to the Apostolic precept, which ordered collections to be made on the first day of the week (*per unam Sabbati*). The testimony of Justin Martyr is quite plain on this point." And the Apostolic Constitutions not only associate the Eucharist entirely with this one day, as the other writings cited have done, but in its injunction, "On the day of the Resurrection of the Lord, that is, the Lord's Day, assemble yourselves together, giving thanks to God," etc., connects it very evidently with the distinctive place which this day was intended to hold above the other days of the week.

The principal service of the chief day of the week thus being the Liturgy, and this service presenting, in its several parts, the vital elements of Christian doctrine and Christian life as these were first taught to the

¹ "The Polity of the Christian Church," etc., by A. A. Pelliccia. Translated from the Latin by Rev. J. C. Bellett, M.A., p. 223.

Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service," Vol. I, p. 187.

Church by the Apostles, great importance was attached in each portion of the Church to the preservation in all essentials of the primitive and Scriptural form it had received in the beginning from its founders or its early bishops and teachers.

There were, as we have already seen, certain differences among these original liturgies, and liturgical scholars have classified them into several groups, according to these variations; but in their general structure they were all moulded on one common idea, and in the fundamental principles of their teachings they were everywhere the same.

For many centuries in the early history of the Church there were no such innovations on its primitive dogmas as departed in any important matter from the original teachings of the liturgies or other appointed services of the Church; but later on new and widely different views on several points of great moment in theology, and on the nature of the ministry, the Church and the Sacraments became gradually dominant, and under their influence most of the offices of the Church were correspondingly modified in either their language or forms, or both.

In some cases considerable portions were interpolated, and numerous ceremonials and accompaniments before unknown were added to the primitive ritual. In others, important elements of the original teaching which did not accord with the ruling theology were dropped out; and in certain parts in which the form and expression still continued unchanged, the introduction of new Rubrics and explanations gave them a new meaning in harmony with the prevailing opinions.

These changes and doctrinal perversions of the Liturgy were far more extensive and significant in the Latin liturgies of Western Europe, especially after they came under the control of Rome, than in those of the East, which had been handed down in the original Greek, and with the language of their earlier form had preserved more of the substance of their original contents.

A comparison of the teachings and forms of the primitive liturgies with the more important of the changes which mark the mediæval doctrine and liturgies of the Church in the West will show what was held to be essential to the true Eucharistic worship in the Apostolic Church, and at the same time how far our order for "The Holy Communion" conforms, both in what it contains and what it has omitted, to the Scriptural and Catholic idea which these ancient offices have preserved for us.

In all the primitive liturgies¹ which we have in their original Greek, the pervading thought and life of the whole service was its dependence on the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost; in all its parts, and for all who were engaged in it or to be benefited by it, its vitality and efficacy came from the personal

¹ The Roman Liturgy was originally in Greek and was similar to all the others [Probst, p. 241, 13], but was gradually modified under the influences of the changes in the theology of the later centuries to the form of the Trentine Missal. Ffoulkes on "The Primitive Consecration of the Eucharistic Oblation," *passim*. [It is hardly possible to adopt, without clearer evidence, all the details of the historical discussion of Dr. Ffoulkes, but in its general conclusions and its presentations of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, this work is one of supreme importance, and deserves most careful study and consideration.]

ministration of the Divine Spirit. Its blessings were conveyed, its ministers empowered, its "gifts" offered and sanctified, its recipients prepared, its communion made living, wholly by the act and bestowal of the Holy Ghost.

These spiritual references are not confined to some few portions only of the primitive offices. They pervade and saturate the whole service, and prayers for the coming and work of the Divine Spirit are offered in connection with every act that is performed, for every good that is desired, and are the means by which the high and solemn work of consecration is always effected.

The vital part of every liturgy, that which decides the nature of the whole office, is "The Consecration." What does it effect? By whom and how is it made? What are its purposes? As the most convenient mode of showing how essential was its connection in all these respects with prayer for the presence of the Holy Ghost, and with the influence and life-giving power of that same Divine Person, I will outline in some detail the Form of Consecration in two or three of the most notable ancient offices, selecting these not as exceptions or peculiar in this regard, but as illustrations of the different modes under which the same element is everywhere presented in these early ages.

I begin with that which is known by the name of "St. James," or sometimes as the "Liturgy of Jerusalem." The consecration is contained in that part of the office¹ which the Greeks call the "Anaphora" or

¹ All liturgies were divided in the early Church into two parts. An introductory service, at which all who desired were allowed to be present, and following this, a service of the faithful, at which only those

“Offering.” This corresponds in a general way to what the Roman Missal designates as “The Canon,” and occasionally the “Actio of the Mass,” and which we know as “The Communion,” in distinction from the “Ante-Communion Service.”

This commences in St. James with expressions still preserved in our Order, “Lift we up our mind and our heart;” “It is meet and right;” “It is verily meet and right, fitting and due to praise Thee,” etc. This introduces a glorious anthem of thanksgiving to God as the Creator of all things, and the Maker “of angels and archangels and all the company of heaven” who with ceaseless tongues and perpetual doxologies are “evermore praising Him and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory.” After this grand “Ter Sanctus,” which we all know so well, comes a short history of the work of Redemption, embodying, as does our “Prayer of Consecration,” the narrative of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. When this speaks of Christ’s “taking the bread,” etc., there is the simple Rubric, “Here the priest takes the bread into his hands;” and when “the cup after supper,” etc., is named, there is a like direction,

who were entitled to commune were permitted to remain, and all who did so remain were required to partake of the Communion. The early portion of the service was called the Pro-Anaphora, the latter part the Anaphora.

Names indicating this division are still preserved, although the distinction between the parts is not enforced. The Romanists call the first part “The Ordinary,” and the other “The Canon of the Mass.” The English and American Churches term them “The Ante-Communion” and “The Communion Service,” but the lines of division between the two portions are different in these offices, and, indeed, have in all ages varied in the services of different branches of the Church.

"Then he takes the cup and saith." The language used in reference to the bread, "Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you," etc., is essentially the same as we have. But with the cup there is a remarkable expression that bears directly on the point especially under consideration. "Having taken the cup, He gave thanks, and blessed, and filled with the Holy Ghost and gave it to us," etc.

At this point the Roman Mass, and all the offices that follow it, pause and declare the consecration entirely completed, and that it is thus completed for each element by itself. According to this theory, at the moment that the priest uttered the words, "For this is my body," the substance of the bread becomes, "by force of the words," the body of Christ, which is immediately adored. The words appropriate to the wine are then pronounced, and the wine, in like manner, becomes the blood of Christ, and is then separately adored. But in the Liturgy before us the service proceeds in a mode which renders such an interpretation of it impossible.

There is no sign, there is no expression which indicates that the consecration has been effected here by these "words" of the priest, nor by the "force of the words" of the priest at any other point.

But instead of regarding the consecration as completed here, this office goes directly on, after the narrative of the institution and its repetition of the actions and words of our Lord, to offer a prayer and oblation of considerable length; then comes that portion of the service which the Church of that period, as also the Greek Church still, asserts to be the actual consecration.

This is preluded by a series of prayers beginning, "O God, according to Thy great goodness "send upon us, and upon these gifts lying before Thee, "Thy most Holy Spirit," etc., the various attributes and operations of the Spirit are afterwards described at length, and finally, as the consummation of this solemn act, His presence is besought to be the Consecrator of the Sacrament, and the Alone Power and Person from whom must come the blessing which the faithful partakers were gathered there to receive.

Accordingly the priest now prays, "Send down the "same most Holy Spirit *upon us*, and on *these gifts* before Thee, that coming upon them with His holy and "good and glorious Presence, He may hallow and make "this bread the holy body of Thy Christ," "and this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ," "that they *may be to those who partake of them* for remission of sins," etc. The consecration is here referred not to the "force" of any words uttered by the priest, but to the power and operation of the Holy Ghost, and as a spiritual means to a spiritual result in those who shall "duly" receive the offered gifts; in accordance with this the Spirit is invoked as the sole agent by whom the Sacrament is hallowed to its sacred uses, and through whose inner working alone we "may," in the language of this same office, "become worthy partakers and communicants of the holy mysteries." This inner operation of the Spirit on our soul is, in fact, interwoven with every portion of the service. In its earlier parts the worshipers are described as those who "seek the spiritual gifts that are "from Thee," and God is besought "to bless them with "every spiritual blessing that cannot be taken away."

The priest prays "for the illumination of the Most Holy Spirit, that he may not be a slave of sin," with many other petitions of like sense and words for both the minister and the people. And in the parts following the consecration, they recur again and again, until the conclusion of the service.

This necessarily condensed and imperfect analysis is wholly inadequate to convey a full representation of the frequency and fervor of the reference to the Holy Spirit in this ancient, and in its essentials, Scriptural and Apostolic service. But enough has been given fully to justify what has been previously stated upon that point, and of which Mr. Ffoulkes¹ has truly said, "From first to last it is on the action of the Holy Ghost that the whole rite depends; 'the whole character of the primitive liturgies being based on the action of the Holy Ghost was *spiritual exclusively* throughout, allowing no carnal conception of any kind to intermingle with it, except to be deprecated and cast forth,' and though they knew Christ well enough after the flesh in professing their faith, they would only know Him after the Spirit in receiving Him."

The other liturgies of this same period are all at one in the expression of these principles with St. James. The Alexandrian Office, known by the name of St. Mark, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost and the prayer that God would "enlighten our soul with the Divine rays of Thy Holy Spirit, that we being filled with the knowledge of Thee," etc., goes on, "The Holy Ghost commands and sanctifies," and the import of this is

¹ Ffoulkes, *ut. sup.*, pp. 40-48.

immediately declared by the response of the priest, "Behold they (the gifts) are sanctified and consecrated." The Liturgy, generally called the Clementine, corresponds very closely in this part of the office to St. James, while the Forms attributed to St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, which are those still in use by the Greeks, are even fuller in their expression of the nature of the operation of the Holy Spirit than many of the others. St. Chrysostom prays, after the consecration of the gifts by the Holy Ghost, "*So that they may be to those that partake, for purification of soul and communion of the Holy Ghost,*" etc. And St. Basil returns to it in a great variety of forms in the latter part of the office, and sums up the blessings to be sought in the Sacrament, "*that we receiving in a pure conscience a portion of the hallowed things may be united to the Holy Body and Blood of Thy Christ—may have Christ dwelling in our hearts and become the temple of Thy Holy Spirit.*"

Similar references from other liturgies might be multiplied to an indefinite extent, but it would be only to weariness. So that we may say as regards this vital principle of the Eucharist, all the primitive and un-mutilated liturgies repeat the same great truth, and with one voice proclaim that this was the accepted and Catholic doctrine of all parts of the Church in those early ages.

But the liturgies are not alone in witnessing that the primitive Church regarded the Eucharist as dependent for its sacramental character on prayer for, or the invocation of, the Holy Spirit and His presence and operation in response to this. Ffoulkes has presented

an elaborate chain of authorities extending over many centuries, and from every section of the Church, all which concur in this as the unquestioned teaching of themselves and the Church of their time.

We can cite but a few from this long array, and give these merely as examples of what, in one form or another, all the rest will be found to affirm whenever they write of the Eucharist.

Cyril, of Jerusalem (about A.D. 360), says,¹ in describing the Eucharistic office, "After we have sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we invoke the God of mercy to send the Holy Ghost, that He may make the bread the body of Christ and the wine His blood," etc. And in reference to the character of the service, in one place he speaks of it as "a *spiritual* sacrifice," and in another that we "stablish our heart by partaking of Christ as *spiritually* present." In like terms St. Augustine,² in Africa, declares (a little later), "We call the body of Christ that only which, taken from the fruits of the earth and consecrated by *mystical prayer*, we then receive to our *spiritual* health in memory of the passion of our Lord for us, and this, * * *

* * * is not sanctified to become so great a Sacrament but by the unseen action of the Holy Spirit." And Ephrem, the Syrian³ from Mesopotamia, a widely distant part of the Church, about the same time as Cyril writes, speaking of the vision in the 10th chapter of Ezekiel: "These coals and *the man* that is clothed in fine linen, are a type of the priest by whose mediatorship the living coals of the life-produc-

¹ Ffoulkes, ut sup., p. 70. ² Augustine De Trinitate, Bk. III, ch. 4.

³ Ephrem Syrus (Oxford Translation), p. 146.

ing body of our Lord are given away. But see there *another cherub* that reacheth them forth and placeth them in his fists! This is a type to show that it is *not the priest* who is able to make the body of the bread, *but another, to wit, the Holy Ghost*; the priest, therefore, doth but lend his hands as a mediator and his lips offer supplications with prayers as a servant suing for mercy."

I have dwelt thus long upon this teaching of the early liturgies, because in them we have the most unquestionable and extensive evidence of the original and Catholic doctrine on the nature of the Holy Eucharist, and through this of the whole mission and ministry of the Church of Christ. "Liturgies" are, in the language of Archdeacon Freeman, "greater than fathers." They are not simply the expression of individual minds, however great, but are the accepted voice and teaching of the Church itself, and that may certainly be regarded as Catholic truth which is contained in all the early liturgies and held by the chiefest of the fathers.

The principle which stands out so prominently in all these ancient offices—that their benefits lie in spiritual influences on "the hearts and minds" of men, and that the means through which these are obtained are the presence and operation of the Holy Spirit—is established in repeated utterances of our blessed Lord, and especially in those portions of His teaching which are definitely connected with this Sacrament. In John vi, 61–63, when the people, who could not accept the words of Christ in any other¹ than a literal and mate-

¹ The language of St. Augustine, in connection with this passage, is eminently worthy of note. Commenting upon it in his course of sermons on St. John, Tractate XI (Clarke's Translations, Vol. X, p. 157), he

rial sense, had turned away from Him, He gives to His disciples the key to the understanding not only of these sayings, but of all that His Church was to do and to teach—"Does this cause you to stumble? It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." And in that wonderful series of discourses in St. John xiv-xvi, spoken at the very time of the Supper, while the words, "This do," etc., were sounding in the ears of the disciples, and which "owe their entire form and contents," as Archdeacon Freeman says, "to the occasion and the acts with which they were connected," the great burden of the whole, the pervading thought to which He returns again and again, and from many different points of view was, "I go away;" nay, "It is expedient for you that I," in person, "go away," that I may send to you the Holy Spirit, "that He may be with you forever;" "He shall teach you," "He shall bear witness of me," "He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you," and "He shall glorify me." That is, the work of the ascended Christ, the power of His Church, the efficacy and blessing of His Sacraments was not to be wrought by His continuance or His return to earth in a corporeal person, but through the spiritual opera-

says: "After He had said, 'Except a man eat my flesh, and drink my blood, he shall not have life in him,' *lest they should understand it carnally* He said, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing,'" etc. And in his "Christian Doctrine," where he is giving instruction how various passages of the Bible are to be interpreted, he cites this text and gives the following explanation: "'Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man,' says Christ, 'and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.' This is a *figure* enjoining that we should have a share in the sufferings of our Lord, and that we should retain a sweet and profitable memory of the fact that His flesh was wounded and crucified for us."—Clarke's Translations, Vol. IX, p. 95.

tion, by the Divine internal workings of the Holy Ghost in the soul of man, or as one of the old English martyrs said to the great puzzlement of his Papal inquisitors,¹ "The Spirit is the Vicar of Christ on the earth." And when pressed to explain what he meant, replied, "Christ, since His ascension, worketh all things in us *by His Spirit*, and *by His Spirit* doth dwell in us."

The late Bishop Odenheimer expressed this truth very clearly and admirably in his Episcopal Charge of 1865: "The administrator of the present dispensation, "from the Day of Pentecost to the Second Advent, is the "Holy Ghost. In truth, there is no power at all for "the Church in these latter days except it come from "the Holy Ghost, by whom Christ is present. This is "as certainly the law of the Church under the present "dispensation, during the physical absence of Christ at "the right hand of the Father, as that there is such a "Divine organism as the Church."

The relation of the Holy Spirit to the Eucharist, as thus affirmed by all the liturgies and the fathers of the early Church, is the basis of all correct understanding of the nature of that Sacrament, and of the mode in which it was to be ministered to the faithful and its benefits appropriated by them.

In this connection there are certain other features of the ancient liturgies which require to be noted, both from the light they shed on the original intention of this Sacrament as "ordained of Christ," and because of the departures from them which grew out of

¹ John Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester. Parker Society, p. 125.

the later and perverted theories of the Middle Age theology.

Every element of these ancient offices was related more or less closely to the principle that the Holy Ghost is the consecrator of the Sacrament, already presented as the primitive and Catholic doctrine. And accordingly we find this presence in the consecration, connected everywhere with the means by which His operation was obtained. This was held upon all hands to be by prayer. There is no trace in any of the primitive liturgies that it was effected by "the force of the words" of our blessed Lord, as uttered by a priest. These were, indeed, repeated by the minister as giving the Divine authority and teaching of the Sacrament, but it is not by them that the consecration was actually made. That was connected not only in the office of St. James, which has been quoted, but in all the others with a special *prayer*, and that, a prayer for the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost.

The narrative of the institution, with its words, was precedent to the prayer of consecration in most, probably in all the original offices, but was not regarded as of itself effectual to that end, and their structure and language fully justify the opinion of Mason Neale: "It must be a mockery to pray for that which is already granted. No reasoning can reconcile us to so palpable an explaining away of plain words. No softening of words, nor explanation except the clear, plain sense can be tolerated." Hence, so far as the voice of Catholic antiquity is regarded, the means of consecration in the Eucharist is *not the words of the priest*, but a *prayer for the Holy Spirit*.

Another essential feature of the early liturgies was

the participation of the people in every portion of the service. It was in its very essence "a communion." The voice of the people was interwoven all through the office with that of the minister by continual versicles and appropriate responsive prayers, and every one of the faithful present participated with the officiating priest in the reception of the "offered gifts." It was thus a sacrament "administered to and partaken of by" the people, and not a vicarious sacrifice offered up by another for them.

The language and form of all the primitive offices are equally definite upon this point as on those previously referred to. The prayers and thanksgivings all imply a joint communion of priest and people, and the pervading thought of all present, from the first word to the last, is that they all "do partake" together of the consecrated gifts "lying before them," and are all alike "to receive" the "holy mysteries" through which the Divine blessing will be vouchsafed to them. Probst says, in reference to this matter, in his *History of the Early Liturgies*,¹ "For one to be present at the Liturgy and not receive the Communion, would have been condemned as something unheard of;" while to worship the person of Christ under the "species" of the bread or of the "wine," as if thus present on the "holy table," or to offer a sacrifice of Christ again, and for mere "lookers-on," or to be a propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead,² or to teach that "*ex opere operato*,

¹ Probst, p. 6: "Der Liturgie anzuwohnen, ohne die Communion, "zu empfangen, wurde als etwas Unerhörtes getadelt."

² Jewell's "Apology," edited by Bishop Wittingham. New York, 1831, p. 59.

"i.e., even for that it is said and done by a priest, it is "able to remove any part of our sin," or that the priest was allowed "to celebrate" alone, "and communicate "and receive the Sacrament for others," without an administration and reception by those present who were entitled to partake, I am quite sure will be sought in vain, whether in the words or the acts in any early¹ liturgy of any part of the Church Catholic.

Another necessary and universal element of the

¹ "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities." Hartford. 1876. 2 vols. Vol. I, p. 415.

"All who were present communicated. This is contemplated in all "the early accounts of Holy Communion. Gratian (Decretum), De Consecrat., ch. II, p. 10, quotes a decree of Pope Anacletus which distinctly "orders all to communicate when consecration is completed, if they "would not be cast out of the Church. The decree is, of course, "spurious" (being part of the pseudo Isidoran forgeries), "but it is interesting as indicating what was the law of the Roman Church at the "time of these forgeries (about A.D. 830), and also that probably "the practice of 'non-communicating attendance' had then begun." It certainly proves that the custom was neither primitive nor Catholic any more than the doctrine on which it was founded. The exact words of the Decretum are, "*Anacletus Papa, Epist. I. '(Circa A.D. 80, traditionally)' peracta consecratione omnes communicent qui noluerint ecclesiasticis carere liminibus. Sic enim et Apostoli statuerunt, et Sancta Romana tenet ecclesia.*"

"The Catholic Dictionary." p. 200: "In ancient times all who assisted at Mass were obliged to communicate."

See, also, Scudamore's "Eucharistica," pp. 392, 397, 682.

Möhler (Romanist) in his well-known "Symbolism," Robertson's Translation, p. 317, says: "The unseemliness of the congregation no longer communicating every Sunday (as was the case in the primitive Church) and of the priest usually receiving alone the body of the Lord, is not to be laid to the blame of the Church, for all the prayers in the Holy Sacrifice presuppose the sacramental communion of the entire congregation." From this it would seem that for our clergy to advocate "non-communicating attendance" surpasses Rome.

Eucharist as originally instituted was the reception by the people, as well as by the "celebrating" priest, of *both* the wine and bread. In all the typical liturgies they are associated in the prayer of consecration as both and equally essential, and in the Institution of the Clementine, St. James, St. Mark, St. Basil, and in the West, the Mozarabic, the two are united as part of a single act, by repeating the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi, 26, "For as often as ye eat this bread AND drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

That such was the universal custom of the early Church no intelligent Liturgist of any school disputes, and it needs mention here only because it is another of the essentials of the Catholic sacramental doctrine which was mutilated under the perversions of mediæval sacerdotalism, and whose restoration in the Anglican Communion and the American Office completes the conformity of our Liturgy, in all its integral elements, to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures and the forms of the Apostolic Church.

The principles which have been stated above and which are found, as has been shown, in all the primitive liturgies, and also the corresponding forms in which they were embodied, may properly be accepted as conclusive evidence of the true nature and meaning of the Eucharist, and of the intended character of the Eucharistic service in all after ages.

Hence any wide departure from these, much more the substitution of any doctrine or practices which actually repudiated them, must be regarded as a loss of Scriptural truth and Catholic teaching, more or less serious according to the nature of the intruded error or altered form.

The history of the Western Church during what is known as "The Mediæval Period," shows that its liturgies have thus been changed in many particulars from the primal type: and that side by side with this, how far as cause and how far effect is not easy to determine, many of the most important teachings which had always been associated with the early forms were displaced by others, some of which were wholly unwarranted by any primitive usage or authority, and others radically subversive of principles which were considered as fundamental in the liturgies and by the acknowledged fathers of the corresponding centuries.

The most important of these departures from the primary conceptions of the Eucharist, that, in fact, *which is the key to all the others*, was the omission in the Roman Canon of the Mass (and in all those which were modeled after it), of all reference to the presence or the operation of the Holy Ghost, as in any wise concerned with either the character or the effects of the Sacrament, and the substitution both in the Rubrics of the Office and the authoritative doctrine imposed on it, of the power and words of a priest, in place of the influence and work of the Spirit.

It has been abundantly shown that in the original liturgies the whole service, from first to last, referred all the power and efficiency of the Sacrament to the Holy Spirit; and that this was especially emphasized by making His operation, in answer to prayer, the universal means through which the consecration of the "offered gifts" was effected, and by which His people were made "meet partakers of these holy mysteries."

In the Canon of the Roman Mass, on the other hand, with the exception of the mere name in the Doxologies, it might almost be said "we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." There is no prayer for His presence to hallow the gifts. There is no hint of a need for Him to purify the heart. We are nowhere taught either to look up to Him as the minister, or within, to His operation as the source of the "grace given unto us." And instead of glowing, as the old offices did, in every part with the language of spiritual fervor and yearnings for the life of the Spirit, there is an utter silence and blank as to this element which is so vital in the sacramental conceptions of the Scriptures and the primitive Church.

Had the omission of all Invocation of the Holy Spirit from its Mass service been the only change in the liturgies of the Western Church the evil would have been great, as the neglect of a fundamental truth must always be, but it would not, in itself, have been subversive of the true sacramental doctrine. This might have been preserved in other formulæ, or set forth in other terms by authoritative standards. But in the Roman Church the early conceptions of the Eucharist had been gradually, and at length wholly supplanted by the mediæval or sacerdotal doctrine of the Mass, and this not only omitted all the references to the Holy Spirit in the Liturgy, but by the employment of other and different prayers, the insertion of Rubrics which gave the Office a meaning before unknown to it, and the multiplication of symbolic forms and ceremonies made the whole service teach, so far as possible, the principles of the new and un-Scriptural dogma. Not only so, but these

new forms and ideas, in their turn, were more and more rigidly defined by the decrees of successive councils¹ and the writings of theologians, so that the progress of error in doctrine, and the perversions of the meaning and use of the Liturgy went side by side, each aiding the other in a furtherance of the evil, until the Council of Trent, in the middle of the sixteenth century, completed the whole system by its definitions, and by its decrees made these binding articles of faith on all who belong to the Roman communion.

Thus, while the loss of the Holy Spirit from the Liturgy and the Eucharist doctrines of the Western Church was one of the most serious errors of the mediæval theology, this is connected in the standards of the Roman Church with other perversions of the primitive and Catholic teaching on the Eucharist, of great importance, both in their theology and in their practical results. Some of these require mention here.

1. Concerns the agent and meaning of the consecration. This is, of course, in no sense referred to the Holy Ghost, nor is it in any part of the office connected with Him or His operation; nor does it depend upon a prayer; neither is it to the end "that these," the offered gifts,

¹The doctrine of Transubstantiation was first formulated by the Fourth Council of the Lateran in 1215. Hefele's (Romanist) "History of the Councils" (French Translation), Vol. VIII, p. 119, says of this Synod: "*Là se trouve pour la première fois le mot transubstantiation.*" The words of the decree are, "in the Eucharist, the same Jesus Christ Himself is both priest and sacrifice—the bread being transubstantiated into the body of Christ and the wine into His blood." But while the central principles of the system were here announced, it was not wrought out to all its consequences until a long time after this, nor completely formulated until the Council of Trent (1545–1563).

"may be to those who partake of them" a means of spiritual benefits. The Romish doctrine teaches that it is an effect wrought upon each element separately (*i.e.*, upon the bread by itself, then upon the wine by itself) by the utterance over it of certain words by a priest. These are called "*the words of consecration*," and are a part of those used by our Lord at the institution of the Supper. The effect of their pronounciation is to produce in each element successively, the great, indeed miraculous change called "Transubstantiation," which change, and the consequences involved in it, constitute, according to the Roman or sacerdotal doctrine of the Eucharist, the essential fact and significance of this Sacrament.

The nature of the momentous results here referred to is given very clearly in "The Catechism of the ¹Council of Trent," which is, however, only an expansion of the authoritative dogma as set forth in the Canons of this same important "Synod." The Catechism says, "The words, 'this is my body,' signify and declare what takes place in the Eucharist," p. 220. "The words accomplish

¹ This is called "The Catechism of Trent," not because set forth by that Council, but because the Council requested the then Pope Pius IV to prepare and issue such a work, to give "the pastors of the Church" instruction in the dogmas and decrees which were approved by the Synod.

It was composed by a commission of learned ecclesiastics during his reign, but he died before its final revision. His successor, Pius V, had it thoroughly examined again, and published it "with authority" in 1566. It has not the absolute authority of the Canons of the Council, but is everywhere regarded as the accepted explanations of their doctrines.

When not otherwise stated I have quoted "Buckley's Translation."

"three things. The first is, that the real body of Christ, "the same that was born of the Virgin, and sits at the "right hand of the Father in heaven, is contained in this "Sacrament. The second is, that no substance of the "element remains there. The third is, that the accidents" (physical qualities and appearances) "which "are beheld by the eyes or perceived by the other "senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner "without a subject." "They inhere in no substance, "but exist by themselves." "The substance of the "bread" (or of the wine) "is so changed into the "body" (or the blood) "of our Lord, that the substance of the bread" (or wine) "altogether ceases to "exist."—P. 224.

2. The *words of consecration* are thus regarded as having the power to change, or transubstantiate, the substance of the bread into the body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into His blood. This is all that, considered simply in their own force, they do; but if Christ is to be present as an actual person, all the other elements of that person—blood, soul and divinity—must be there, as well as body, and the production of this result rests on a theory as mechanical and unspiritual as the doctrine it was intended to sustain. A living body must have with it whatever "appertains to the character of true body, such as bones and nerves" (p. 229), and, of course, blood. And in the case of Christ there is also, after His resurrection, "His soul and divinity." This natural and necessary connection of the different elements of a person is known among theologians as "concomitance," and as Christ is a living person, He is also subject to this same law of concomi-

tance. Accordingly, by reason of this natural property of things, when the words "this is my body" are said, the body of Christ is instantly present by "the force of the words;" and because where there is a living body there must also by this concomitance be blood and soul, and in the risen Christ His divinity, all these are of necessity now present with His body on the altar, and consequently the whole person of Christ is contained under the appearance of the bread,¹ and He is really present there.

What is thus taught of the presence of Christ "by concomitance" under the form of the bread, applies also, conversely, to the wine; the blood of Christ only is there by force of the words, "this is the cup of my blood," etc. The body of Christ, as well as His soul and divinity (that is, Christ as a person), being then made present, not, indeed, by virtue of the consecration, but as united to "the blood," or in the words of Aquinas, "*Ex reali concomitantia—eò quod nunc sanguis Christi non est ab ejus corpore separatus,*" etc.

¹"The Trent Catechism," p. 230: "Since to the body are united the blood, soul and divinity, all these also will be in the Sacrament, *not, indeed*, by virtue of the consecration, but as united to the body."

Thomas Aquinas seems to have given this doctrine its permanent expression, and he explains it as follows: "*Si aliqua duo sunt realiter conjuncta, ubicumque est unum realiter, oportet et aliud esse, ubicumque est corpus Christi necesse est et ejus divinitatem esse consequens est quod divinitas vel anima Christi non sit in hoc sacramento ex vi sacramenti sed ex reali concomitantia.*"—*Summa Theologica. Pars III. Ques. LXXVI. Art. 1.*

"*Sub utraque specie sacramenti totus est Christus; aliter tamen et aliter, nam sub speciebus panis est quidem corpus Christi, ex vi sacramenti, sanguis autem ex reali concomitantia, sub speciebus vero Vini est quidem sanguis Christi ex vi sacramenti, corpus autem Christi, ex reali concomitantia sicut anima et divinitas.*"—*Ut. sup., Art. 2.*

The Real Presence of Christ is, therefore, in the theology of the Mass, produced in its entirety in the Sacrament, wholly by reason of the "concomitance" (or "natural connection") of the several elements of His person one with another. So wholly does it depend on this assumption that Aquinas,¹ more than once, declares that if there should have been a celebration of this Sacrament during the three days Christ was in the grave, the body of Christ would have been present under the species of bread without the blood, and the blood under the species of wine without the body; but His soul would not have been there, either by "force of the Sacrament," or by its "actual concomitance," as it then was separated from the body.

The theory of the relation of the Sacrament to Christ thus devised by the sacerdotal theology carries with it certain most important applications, some of which are maintained as essential doctrines, and others are obvious and almost inevitable practical results.

3. Among the former is the teaching that Christ, having been made present as a total person in each element² separately, by the joint action of the words

¹ "*Si in illo triduo mortis fuisset hoc sacramentum celebratum, non fuisset ibi anima Christi nec ex vi sacramenti nec ex reali concomitantia.*" *Summa*, Ques. LXXVI, Art. 1. "*Nunc sanguis Christi non est ab ejus corpore separatus sicut fuit tempore passionis et mortis: unde si tunc fuisset hoc sacramentum celebratum, sub speciebus panis fuisset corpus Christi sine sanguine, et sub speciebus vini sanguis sine corpore, sicut erat in rei veritate.*" —*Ut. sup.*, Art. 3, also Ques. LXXI, 4.

² No authoritative explanation has been attempted of the necessity of the double presence of the person of Christ on the altar. And as He is wholly present in person on the consecration of the bread, and in that species is fully given to the lay communicant, it is difficult to im-

of the priest and the concomitance of nature, must be worshiped separately in each; first in the species of the bread, and then under that of the wine.

And it is also taught that so long as either element remains incorrupt, His whole person continues in its actuality in that element, and in each several part of it, should it be broken or spilled; accordingly, as thus the true God-man in person, present under these forms on the altar, adoration must be given Him there. Hence it is ordained that "the faithful should exhibit the worship of Latria, which is due to the true God, to this most Holy Sacrament" (Canon of Trent, Session XIII, Chapter 5). But to "exhibit the worship of Latria to the Sacrament," or to perform "acts of adoration" to the person of Christ as being on the holy table or under the form of the bread or the wine, is not indicated or warranted either by word or action in any primitive liturgy. Therefore when this opinion of the corporal presence of Christ on the altar became the accepted doctrine of the West, in place of the early teaching on the spiritual nature of Christ's relation to us in the Eucharist, it was natural and inevitable that the services should be modified accordingly, and made in their performance to express what was now come to be held as the doctrine; hence we find ceremonies and gestures and postures and forms before unknown, or

agine any reason for the second presence. The Catechism states that "it was ordained with very good reason," but it certainly does not show what the good reason was. Maskell moots the question "if the bread is consecrated and becomes the body of Christ without any consecration of the chalice?" and says the greatest authorities have decided that it is valid even when the wine is not consecrated, but that it is not lawful.—*"Ancient Liturgies,"* p. 136.

wholly unconnected with any such conception, introduced into the Mass, to convey and enforce this opinion among the people, and thus the adoration of Christ as personally, bodily present on the altar became finally an essential part of Divine worship throughout all the churches of the West.

The establishment of this adoration as a form of worship dates only from the thirteenth century. And one of the most notable of the customs which then came in with it was that of elevating each of the elements immediately¹ on the utterance of its "words of consecration," that it may be adored by the people, as also by the priest. A few years later it became common to sound a small bell, called the "sacring bell," at the time of the elevation, to direct the attention of the people to the act of devotion which was then to be per-

¹ Bishop England (Roman Catholic Bishop of Charleston, U. S. A.), in his work on "The Nature and Ceremonies of the Mass," says, p. 113: "The custom of elevating the Host and chalice immediately after consecration was not introduced until after the heresy of Berengarius, who, 'about the middle of the eleventh century, began to raise doubts of the 'real presence. The custom of ringing the small bell was introduced 'soon after that of the first elevation.' (Berengarius was really defending the old view against later corruptions.) "The Catholic Dictionary" says: "The elevation seems to have begun about 1100. The further 'custom of ringing a small bell at the elevation began in France 'during the twelfth century, and was introduced into Germany in '1203 by Cardinal Gui, Legate of the Holy See."

Hardwicke's "Church in the Middle Ages" states, p. 304, note 1: "The 'first recorded instance of 'adoration' in Germany (*i. e.*, of kneeling 'down before the Host as an object of worship) is said to have occurred 'in the thirteenth century" (circa 1215). This was also the year in which the doctrine of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the forms of bread and wine (or Transubstantiation) was first formulated at the Fourth Lateran Council.

formed. The usages and the theory grew side by side together, but both the doctrine and its accompanying ceremonial were¹ wholly due to the mediæval perversions of the primitive and Catholic theology of the early liturgies, and they are equally at variance with these venerable Eucharistic offices and with the truths of Holy Scripture. Where the ancient truth of the Holy Communion is held there is no place for the mediæval doctrine of the Mass, nor for the ceremonial and forms by which this is illustrated and maintained.

4. As the whole person of Christ is contained, on this theory, "under the species of bread alone," it was obvious that He could also be worshiped in the consecrated bread alone without any need for the consecration of the wine, and He could be received entire by the taking of the bread only. Hence came at length the exclusion of the laity from partaking of the wine. This was reserved for the "celebrating priest" only, the other clergy present and the communing laity being given the bread alone. Various reasons have been assigned for this mutilation of Christ's Institution, but the ground of the great importance attached to it in

¹ The mode in which the adoration and elevation are to be performed in the Roman Mass is, "Holding the Host (the bread) in both hands between his forefingers and thumbs, he utters the words of consecration, 'For-this-is-my-body,' secretly, distinctly, devoutly, attentively. Having finished the words, he immediately kneels and adores the consecrated Host. Then rising he elevates it on high, and shows it to the people to be adored, and again adores it himself."

The same also is done at the consecration of the wine. The elevation was not made a part of the Canon Law until 1217, under Pope Honorius III. See in *Corpus Juris Decretal Greg.*, Lib. III, Title XLII, chap. 10.

the Roman doctrine is its theological significance, which, as stated by the Catechism of Trent, was to¹ show "that the body is contained under the species of "bread without the blood, and the blood under the "species of wine without the body," hence that Christ himself could be worshiped and received in either.

Another inference² equally logical and necessary from the principles of this system, was that the body of Christ is taken by the wicked when they eat the consecrated bread, as well as by those receiving by faith, and also if the consecrated host or a portion of the species of wine is swallowed by an animal or fall into an unclean place, Christ still remains present under the form of the element (though He contracts no impurity), and continues there so long as the species (or the form of the bread or wine) remains undestroyed or unchanged.

These are one and all legitimate deductions from the theory of this school, but they are utterly foreign to

¹ The full statement of the Catechism (Buckley's Translation, chap. IV, Ques. LXIII, p. 249, is, after giving several reasons of propriety why the cup should be denied, "Finally, a circumstance of the utmost importance, means were to be taken to uproot the heresy of those who denied that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under the species of bread without the blood, and the blood under the species of wine without the body. In order, therefore, to place more clearly before the eyes of all the truth of the Catholic" (really Roman) "Faith, communion under one kind, that is, under the species of bread, was wisely introduced."

² Aquinas "Summa," etc., Part III, Ques. LXXX, § 3: "*Etiam si mus vel canis hostiam consecrantam manducet, substantia corporis Christi non desinet esse sub speciebus quamdiu species illae manent, sicut etiam si proficeretur in lutum.*"

the nature of the Eucharist as instituted by our Lord, delivered to St. Paul, and embodied in the liturgies of the Apostolic and its succeeding ages.

5. The primitive conception of the Eucharist, as derived from the words of Holy Scripture and the language of the early liturgies, had been that it was "for¹ "the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the "death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive "thereby," but with the substitution in the mediæval formulæ of the "priest" and his office, for the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit came, as a natural development, the still further and, if possible, yet more fatal perversion that the Mass was an actual repetition on the altar, by the priest, of Christ's own sacrifice of Himself on the cross. In the Canon of Trent it is declared,² "In this Divine sacrifice—in the Mass—the same Christ is contained and immolated in a bloodless manner, who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross," hence "this sacrifice is truly propitiatory." "For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of the priests, the manner alone of offering being different." In the Catechism it is expressed somewhat more fully: "The sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that on the cross, for the victim is one and the same, namely, Christ our Lord, who offered Himself once only a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross: the bloody and unbloody victim are not two but one victim only, whose sacrifice is daily

¹ "The Church of England Catechism."

² Canon of Trent, session XXII.

renewed in the Eucharist." "The priest also is *one and the same Christ our Lord*," for "acting in the person of Christ the Lord he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of His body and blood." (Catechism, chap. 4, Ques. LXXIII, LXXIV.)

It is likewise declared that this propitiation applies the sacrifice of Christ not only to the living and those who are present, but also can avail for the relief of "the sins, punishments, satisfactions and other necessities of the faithful who are departed in Christ and "who are not as yet fully purged" (by their purgatorial sufferings); or in the slightly different language of the Catechism, "Such is the efficacy of this sacrifice of the Mass that its benefits extend to those who "have died in the Lord whose sins have not yet been "fully expiated."

This fiction of the power of the Mass to release souls from their penal sufferings in the other world is the logical and practical culmination of the mediæval perversion of the Scriptural doctrine of the Eucharist we have been considering. It has neither ground nor support in the Bible or the early liturgies, while it rests on principles and involves ideas wholly unknown to either. In it the character of a Sacrament has entirely disappeared, nor is there any longer the vestige of a *spiritual use or significance* attached to it, even as a sacrifice, and instead of being a means of the union of the faithful soul with Christ through the ministry of the Holy Ghost, it has been transformed into a purely mechanical agency by which the penalties due to God from the yet "unpurged" departed may be paid off and satisfied. And in view of both its theological errors and its practical evils our 31st Article is fully

justified in its strong language, "Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it is commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Such were some of the more important perversions of the Sacramental and Catholic doctrines of the early liturgies, which had resulted from the sacerdotalism of the Middle Ages, and which, with the abuses and superstitions growing out of them, formed one of the subjects that engaged most earnestly the thoughts of the English reformers of the sixteenth century, and was most vehemently discussed between them and their Roman adversaries.

Indeed, next to their opposition to the Papacy, the leaders of the English Reformation directed their efforts chiefly against the mediæval conceptions of the Eucharist, and the practical errors and evils which they regarded as essential parts of the doctrine as it was then accepted. The overweening assumption of the priesthood as the disposers, through masses and absolutions, of man's future destiny and present hope, the mechanical conceptions and uses of the Sacrament thus induced and fostered upon every hand, the palsying idea of religion as chiefly a matter of ceremonial and usages and official rites, and the innumerable superstitions and corruptions of the truth which, in the course of centuries, had gathered necessarily around theories so little spiritual in their character, and seemingly so material in both their means and ends, these all were portions of the same one system, and neither in its principles nor its practices had they any Scriptural warrant or primitive authority.

As the theology which had thus become supreme in Western Europe, and the evil results we have been tracing, were everywhere connected with a loss of that Spiritual conception of the Eucharist which had been presented by our Lord, and embodied in the early liturgies, it is evident that the remedy was to be found in a return to the essentials of these ancient offices and the Scriptural truths which were inculcated by them.

Indeed these primitive services were from their authors and the conditions of their origin the highest and best expression, outside the Bible, of the sacred verities with which they were concerned, and were in fact the forms appointed by the Apostolic founders of the Church to be for its continual guidance, pattern and instruction till the end of time.

This was the fundamental principle on which the English reformers acted, and which the Church of England has embodied in her "Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," and has established in the formulæ of doctrine set forth by her authoritative standards, "The Catechism" and the "Articles of Religion." It is this same Liturgy in its general features, and these same doctrines which are presented to us in the Communion Office and the Standards of the Church in the United States. Accordingly we have in our Liturgy and the teachings of our Articles and Catechism, a restoration of all that is essential, both in form and doctrine, of the original and Catholic conception of the Eucharist. And the attempts of certain individuals of the present day to introduce again into our services the doctrines and ceremonies repudiated by the reformers of the English Church,

and those who followed them in the church in the United States can in no sense be regarded as a restoration of the true Catholic teachings of the Apostolic ages, but only a return to the mediæval perversions of the real catholicity of the early forms.

As to the contents of our service, it has all the fundamental elements of the early offices. The bread and wine (called "gifts" in the ancient forms) are "placed on" the "holy table," with a prayer for their acceptance, and with supplications for the Divine blessing on "the Universal Church," and for all the "state of Christ's Church militant." Those who "are minded to receive" are prepared, as of old, by a solemn confession of their sins, and a prayer assuring them of the forgiveness of all who truly come. It presents Christ in "His one oblation of Himself once offered," as "a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world." It narrates the words and repeats the acts of our Lord, at the "institution" of the Holy Sacrament, and with the bread and wine thus blessed "we now offer" to the Father "the memorial Christ hath commanded us to make." But neither here nor in the primal forms is the uttering of the words of Christ presented as the real consecration of the Sacrament. In all the Catholic liturgies this was regarded as the operation of the Holy Ghost,¹ and

¹ The English Liturgy is greatly lacking in having no Invocation of the Holy Spirit in its Prayer of Consecration. This very important feature of the early Offices has been providentially restored to our Order, and in this we are much more nearly at one with the early forms than the Church of England. But the whole tenor of the English service as well as the Articles show that she understands and receives this sacrament as essentially a spiritual act, both in its conditions and its effects.

of Him alone, and the means through which His presence and His consecration were obtained was always prayer. So we, too, pray that the "Father" would "vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with His word and Holy Spirit these gifts and creatures of bread and wine," that we who receive them worthily "may be partakers of the most precious body and blood" of "His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." Nor is there in our Liturgy any sign or hint of worship addressed to Christ as present in bodily person upon the altar, but following the thought, and in almost the very language of the ancient offices, our Prayer regards the chief purpose of the consecration to be that they who in faith "partake of this Holy Communion" may receive the benefits of Christ's death and passion, "and be made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them and they in Him."

While our Office has thus preserved in all its essential features the same Scriptural truths which were embodied in the primitive liturgies, the teachings of the Standards of the American Church upon the nature and significance of this Sacrament are not less clear and strong.

Both in the Catechism and in the Articles there is the most emphatic protest against any mere mechanical operation of the Sacrament, or any expressions that savor of material relations, or imply its power to benefit a man independently of his internal state and spiritual co-operation. In the Catechism we are taught that the "thing signified in the Lord's Supper is the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful." The Twenty-fifth Article de-

clares "That the Sacraments were not ordained of Christ "to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we "should duly use them, and in such only as worthily "receive the same they have a wholesome effect or "operation." How we must "worthily receive" is told in Article Twenty-eight: "The body of Christ is given, "taken and received in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith;" while in denial of the quasi-physical conception of the sacerdotal theory, the Thirty-ninth Article treats "of "the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use "of the Lord's Supper," and says, quoting St. Augustine, that, "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, "although they do carnally and visibly press with their "teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, "yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ."

With like distinctness, also, "this Church" declares there is but one sacrifice of Christ, and that on the cross of Calvary (Article Thirty-one). "The offering of Christ "once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation "and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, "and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that "alone." Christ hath, indeed, in the words of "the Book of 1549," "left in those holy mysteries, as a "pledge of His love and a continual remembrance of "the same, His own blessed body and precious blood "for us to feed upon spiritually," "for then we spirit- "ually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood." We also do "offer the Holy gifts" to the Father, and in this "make here the memorial Christ hath commanded us to make," but there is no hint here or elsewhere that

it is a repetition of the sacrifice upon the cross, or a sacrifice again of Christ upon the altar, or that any propitiation is made there for the "remission of pain or guilt" for either "quick or dead;" and as our Church thus rejected the teachings of the Middle Age theology, it, of course, also *abandoned the ceremonies*, such as genuflexions, elevation, adoration, and assisting by mere presence at the sacrifice of the Mass, which had been introduced "to display more fully" as the Catechism of Trent says, the distinctive features of this theory. They had no warrant in the early liturgies, and do not belong to their age or doctrine. Their source and only significance comes from the system which they symbolize, and as the Church in the United States has never held the doctrine of this system, so has it refused to allow its ceremonial, and the Twenty-eighth Article affirms most unmistakably the mind of the Church upon this whole matter, in its declaration, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped."

In this same line, too, is the restoration to the people, as has been already noted, of their part in every "celebration" of the "Lord's Supper." They are not only to receive, "as the Lord hath commanded," both the wine and the bread, but, the intention of "this Church" is that those of the faithful who are present at the Sacrament shall partake of the Communion, and in the language of one of the Homilies, they "must be guests, not gazers, eaters, not lookers-on; feeding ourselves, not hiring others to feed for us, that we may live by our own meat," etc. In other words, it is not a service to be performed by the priest alone, but one in which

they are to be "partakers of these holy mysteries" with him. As Strype informs us, one chief purpose of the first English revision of the Liturgy was "the alteration of the Mass into a Communion,"¹ and our whole order, from its title to its concluding prayer, is based on this conception. Its preliminary exhortation announces the purpose to "administer" it, and is addressed only to those who are "disposed to receive." Both the invitations are for those who come "to take this holy Sacrament;" the confession and the prayer of humble access belong to none but those who "shall receive;" and the prayer after the Communion gives thanks for the spiritual feeding of those alone "who have duly received" the body and the blood of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. In this, again, as in the points previously referred to, we have in our Liturgy the true Scriptural conception of the Eucharist, and may say, with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; and the bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

Our Liturgy has thus in all its important elements preserved the forms of the early Church and of Apostolic origin, and like them, too, it finds its interpretation and application in the discourses of our Lord and the narratives of His institution of this Sacrament which He left for our guidance "until He come again." With them it places the essence of the Christian life, and the personal value of every Sacra-

¹ Strype's *Life of Cranmer*. Book I, chap. 30.

ment and ordinance of the Church in the operation and influence of the Holy Spirit. All the benefits which are promised are spiritual; the means are effectual only when blessed by the Spirit, and in our Holy Communion, as in them, the blessing sought and if sought earnestly obtained, is the two-fold communion, on the one hand of our soul with Christ, in which "we be made one with Him and He one with us," and on the other of our hearts and lives in spiritual unity with "the blessed company of all faithful people," with whom we are thus knit together as one living body in Him.

But neither eighteen hundred years ago nor now can forms, merely as forms, convey to us the power of these vital truths of Christ. No explanations of either the ancient liturgies or our own can ever give us the full depth of their Divine and holy meanings without our own careful study of their contents, and a prayerful endeavor to live out the life for which they call; and no discussion of their doctrines or their structure can ever teach us their spiritual worth without "an offering of ourself, our soul and body, to be unto God a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice," and a constant desire "to be filled with His grace and heavenly benediction," and thus enabled "to do all such good works as He has prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

LECTURE III.

THE DAILY SERVICES OF THE EARLY CHURCH—THE
MEDIÆVAL BREVIARY—THE AMERICAN ORDER FOR
DAILY MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER—THE PRIM-
ITIVE DOCTRINE OF CONFESSION—THE ROMAN SAC-
RAMENT OF PENANCE—CONFESSION IN THE AMERI-
CAN PRAYER BOOK.

IN the last lecture I indicated some of the more im-
portant relations of the "Communion Office" in
the American Prayer Book to the Holy Scriptures and
to the liturgies of the Apostolic age and Church.

This service was presented first in our study of the
Prayer Book because it has always been regarded as
the highest and most distinctive act of public worship
of the Church, and also because the doctrine of the
Eucharist involves all the vital elements of the nature
of the Church and of its ministrations, of the relations
of the individual soul to Christ, and of the aims and
means of Christian growth and cultivation, as Dr. Dix
has¹ well said: "What is held about the Sacrament of
"the altar, and done in celebrating and administering
"it, must always be the test of a religious body."

If we regard the key-note to this to be that it derives
its true force and meaning from the operation of the

¹ "Lectures on the Prayer Book of 1549," p. 10.

Holy Spirit, that the Divine and actual consecrator is the Spirit, that its benefits lie in the spiritual use we, the receivers, make of it, that as such it demands, as a necessary condition of its worthy reception, faith in those who partake; in a word, if we accept the sacramental doctrine contained in the discourses of our Lord and embodied in all the early liturgies and fathers, we will apply those same principles to all the other offices of the Church, and to the mode in which we shall employ these, for the right development of our Christian life and character. But if in our doctrine of the Eucharist we substitute "the priest" and "the force of the words of consecration" in place of "the blessing" of the Holy Spirit, given in answer to the prayer for His coming, and in consequence consider the presence of Christ such as to be described under physical terms and subjected to material conditions, we shall unavoidably connect the Sacrament with mechanical notions, and regard its effects as very largely dependent on mere mechanical operations; hence also our conceptions of the Church, its means of grace, the work of its ministry and the nature of the religion it fosters, will all be correspondingly materialistic and formal. We have already seen abundant evidence that these were the actual characteristics of the mediæval or sacerdotal theology of the Mass in "the dangerous deceits" of masses for the dead, the giving "the whole Christ" in the communion of the bread only, the attributing of sacrificial efficacy to the celebration by the priest alone with no reception by the people, and the worship due only to the true God given, as also due, to the Sacrament.

Our Church has shown both in the contents of her liturgy and the teachings of her standards that she gives no warrant in her doctrine of the Eucharist, either to these practices or to the opinions of which they are the expression and intended symbol. On the contrary, she everywhere places it in the same connection with the Holy Spirit and the spiritual, which we found so constant and fundamental in all the Scriptural and primitive references to that Sacrament.

Hence, as the other offices of the Church had, of necessity, been conformed during the Middle Ages to the doctrine of the Mass then dominant, so did the reformed English Church restore ALL her services to their original character and intention upon essentially the same principle, and in the same general mode with her restoration of the Liturgy.

We know that from the very beginning of the Church, besides the general gathering of the people on the Lord's day, or first day of the week, with its Eucharist, there were also other meetings of the devout for worship at other hours of this day, and as well on all the other days of the week.

The author of the "Acts of the Apostles" informs us that the Christians in Jerusalem continued "steadfastly in the teaching of the Apostles and the communion, and the breaking of bread, *and the prayers.*" In this fervid time of Pentecostal glow and enthusiasm, when the new converts had "all things common, and parted them to all, according as any man had need," it is not probable their gatherings for prayer were limited to any special hours or occasions; but when the Church had assumed a regular and settled form, we find that

its services of daily worship were also fixed at certain periods of the day, and everywhere presented essentially the same elements and character.

The services thus established were "from immemorial ages—that is, we know not how early—three, resolving themselves in practice into two. The first was the midnight or nocturnal office, commencing at or after midnight, and extending to the dawn of day, following immediately upon this at the dawn¹ without any interval was the early morning office." These two (or one) services, according to the way in which they are regarded, constituted the daily morning prayers.

The second occasion of the daily prayers was "the evening office, taking place not earlier than 5 P.M."²

There were, doubtless, gatherings of the very devout for prayer and praise together at other times than these. Both the examples of the Old Testament saints, and the natural impulse of earnest piety would lead many to this. So it has been with men of fervid zeal in every period, and we find mention especially of the 3d, the 6th and the 9th hours as times when it was peculiarly fitting that Christians should lift up their hearts in prayer; but although the benefits of such frequent "hours of prayer" are urged, "and various reasons given for their observance, they were evidently regarded as opportunities for regular private devotion rather than for public worship."³

We may accordingly regard the ORDINARY public

¹ Freeman's "Divine Service," Vol. I, p. 88.

² Freeman's "Divine Service," Vol. I, p. 89.

³ Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices of the Church."

worship of the primitive Church to have consisted of two great daily offices; the first (whether we consider it as one or two) early in the morning, and the second at the close of the day.

These daily services corresponded in all their general relations with our order for "Daily Morning and Evening Prayer," and most of the leading features of our office have been derived from them or are conformed to them. And we can best understand our own services by a knowledge of the characteristics of these ancient forms, and the place they were intended to occupy in the worship of the Church and the life of the individual Christian.

The form of the morning prayer, as it had continued to the middle of the fourth century, is given very fully by St. Basil of Cæsarea¹ (circa 360 A.D.). He says: "The customs which now prevail among us are "consonant and agreeable to all the Churches of God. "The people rising early while it is night come to the "house of prayer, and there with much labor and affliction, and contrition and tears, make confession of "their sins to God. When this is done, they rise from "prayers and dispose themselves to psalmody. Then "with psalmody they carry on the night, praying betwixt while or intermingling prayers with their "psalms. At last, when the day begins to break forth, "they all in common, as with one mouth and one heart, "offer up to God the psalm of confession (probably the "fifty-first), everyone making the words of this psalm "to be the expression of his own repentance." "The

¹ In Bingham, Bk. XIII, ch. 10, § 13.

“evening service,” Bingham tells us, “which was called “the ‘*hora lucernaris*,’ because it began at the time of lighting the candles toward the close of the day, was “in most parts the same with that of the morning, only “with such variations of psalms and hymns and prayers “as were proper to the occasion.”¹

The offices for the two periods of the day being thus alike in their general character, we may describe the ordinary worship of the Church as consisting of, first, a profoundly penitential introduction and conclusion, the opening portion being an earnest confession by the whole congregation with prayer for forgiveness, and the closing part, the chanting of the fifty-first psalm, to be applied as the personal expression of each of those present. Second, a large amount of sacred songs, mostly the psalms of David, but often with devotional hymns; these were sometimes said “alternately, one answering another, and again one alone begins the psalm and the rest join in at the close of every verse.” Third, an outpouring of a variety of prayers, some for the needs of different classes of the present congregation, and others for the faithful all over the world, and “for the state of the Church Catholic” as a whole. Archdeacon Freeman² thinks that a short form of the Creed was also used from a very early date as a part of these services; this certainly was the case further on. But there seems no definite proof that it was so in the primitive offices, and from what we know of the contents and structure of these primal forms, its presence in them is very doubtful.

¹ Bingham, Bk. XIII, ch. 11, § 1.

² Freeman’s “Divine Service,” Vol. I, p. 97.

It is evident from the preceding outline of these ancient services, that whatever variations there may be in the details, or in the order of the several parts, they are the same in all that is essential, whether of substance or purpose, with our existing offices of daily morning and evening prayer.

We begin, as they did, with a general confession and prayer for "true repentance and His Holy Spirit," that we may receive the Divine pardon and "remission of sins." The chief element of the following portions of our "Orders" is, as with them, a "Service of Song," the greater part of which comes from the psalms of David, the remainder being spiritual hymns out of the Bible, or expressed in language almost wholly Biblical. And we, too, pray for our own personal needs, for the revelation of God's truth in "all nations," and to "all sorts and conditions of men." And more especially for the Divine Spirit and blessing on "His Holy Church Universal," and for the right guiding and governance of "all who profess and call themselves Christians."

The only notable differences between these offices as we now have them and those of the early Church, is the absence from the primitive daily services of any considerable Scripture readings, which form so large and important a factor in both of our "Orders."

Lessons from the Bible were a constant and integral element in all the ancient liturgies; "The Sacred Oracles of the Old Testament and the Prophets;" "The Memoirs of the Apostles," and the Accounts of Christ's "Incarnation and Sufferings," etc., etc., "are read at great length" (or as Freeman renders the word, "through and through"), and in the language under-

stood by the people, "And this is done on all occasions in the Holy Celebration," "then when the reader has ceased, the President verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things."

But universal as this Scripture reading and teaching was in all the liturgical services, there is no proof that it formed a part of the ordinary daily offices in the first three or four centuries of the Church. These consisted only, during all that period, in acts of confession and penitence, combined with sacred hymns and psalmody and outpourings of prayer. And the reason for the omission of Bible lessons from these offices is probably to be found in their relation to the other portions of the Church's worship and in the special purpose they were designed to serve in the growth and cultivation of the Christian life.

The question of the distinctive character of the daily services, and their connection with the Sacramental offices has been frequently discussed and often very much confused in the discussion. Archdeacon Freeman, who has given this subject a full, and in some respects most suggestive consideration, regards "the ordinary worship" of the Church as essentially a continuation and personal application of the great sacramental services. He says: "It is strictly complementary to them as filling up their¹ idea, not supplementary as if adding anything to it." And he finds in this all their necessity and benefits. They are indeed adjuncts and subsidiary to the Divine Sacraments, and from the nature of the Church and its Sacraments this

¹ Freeman, *ut sup.*, p. 202.

must be so. If the one of these is the means of the union of the soul and the whole man with the Church and life of Christ, and the other is given for his spiritual nurture, communion and self-sacrifice, through the constant receiving and feeding on Christ by "the Spirit," and "as a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ," whatever is or can be done, whether of private endeavor or by the public worship of the Church, must be in some way dependent on or related to the idea of one or the other of these Sacraments. But this does not account for the especial characteristics which distinguish these daily services, nor for their limitation to the few and peculiar elements which originally entered into their composition.

The fundamental difference in the two classes of service appears to me to be derived from two closely related yet profoundly different attitudes of man's soul before God, as He is made known in the Gospel and presented to us in His Church.

In one of these conditions God presents Himself to men in the character of the Divine Giver, and we come before Him chiefly as receivers. This is the distinctive purpose of the Sacraments, and of His revelation of Himself in Holy Scriptures. The very definition of a Sacrament is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us." They require indeed for their "wholesome effect or operation"¹ proper dispositions in those who receive them, with a life corresponding to what they "represent," and they are administered with forms that call into play many and

¹ Articles of Religion, Art. 25.

various elements of our mental and spiritual self, but yet in each the inner and vital reality is a gift of God to us, and our attitude before Him is that of receivers and partakers of the blessing that is given.

But the Christian life requires more for its complete development and perfecting than merely to be a recipient of Divine gifts and favors. Man needs to express his own inner life and feelings, to realize and make known his felt necessities, to soar upward in the utterance of his holy aspirations, to confess and beg forgiveness for the sins that oppress him—in a word, to respond by his own acts and speech to the blessings that have been given him by Christ. If he is to cultivate his entire being as a child of God, he must let his whole self open out its thoughts, and pour forth its desires and praises to the Divine, and must, in conscious penitence and prayer, unfold the struggles of his inmost spirit to the ear of God.

The character of the daily services of the Church in their original form corresponds precisely to these requirements. They were throughout expressive of man's upward look toward God, and were the speaking out of his own self to God. The worshiper was not there so much to receive or learn from Christ, as to meditate and feel, and utter forth his own heart and yearnings as a child of Christ. And in this personal self-exercise of the soul, and its responding in its own acts and words back to God, it not only manifests its entire dependence upon Him, and love for Him, but also realizes more fully what a true life in God should be, and at the same time both applies the gifts which the Gospel has already given him, and is the better

prepared for the right use of those which he must always need to receive.

In this view of the nature of these services there was no need in them of Scripture reading as instruction. This as essentially a gift of God to man was placed with the other acts expressive of the Divine giving in the Liturgy, and for a considerable period was confined almost wholly to this service.

There were, indeed, large portions of the Bible in the daily services then, as with us now. In fact these constituted a chief element in both the morning and evening prayer; but only those parts of the Scripture were employed which represented man speaking himself forth to God, and it was from its peculiar appropriateness for this purpose that the Psalter entered so largely into these offices. This is the only portion of the Bible in which, as a whole, man opens out his own heart to the Deity. The other writings tell us mainly of God, are from Him, instruct us in His will, reveal His love, His works and ways. This marvelous collection is all from man's face turned Godwards. It is the universal, ever sounding voice of human nature, as it cries up to God in seeking, hope, struggle, agony, penitence, joy, trust, praise and prayer. There is no phase of the heart of man, or of man's life that is not here—calm meditation, heart-broken confession, humiliating self-abasement, confiding trust in the Divine forgiveness, indignant wrath, sublime devotion, agonizing desolation that would have been despair but for a hope in God, and such exultant praise as never elsewhere has been hymned by human tongue or pen, all find a voice, and all are given fitting utterance in

this wonderful self-revelation of the human soul to God.

It is because the Psalter is this, and has thus given to men everywhere the fullest and fittest means of expressing their thoughts, and struggles and aspirations to God that it has always been, and to the end of time will be, the chiefest element in that part of the worship of the Church in which man presents himself as a conscious soul before God, to respond by his own words to Christ's giving, and with heart and voice to seek for more and more of the blessings of Christ's love.

So long as the two classes of service retained their primitive characteristics unchanged, the Scripture reading and instruction were given with every Liturgy, but the daily offices consisted chiefly of the confessions, psalms and prayers of the worshipers, as at the first.

After a time, however, the same influences that led during the Middle Ages to so many other changes in the Eucharistic worships of the Church caused also the practical exclusion of the reading of the Bible from the Mass, only the short gospel and epistle for the day were retained, and these in a language unknown to the congregation; and following in the same line with this the daily offices, which had, in other respects, been widely perverted from their original intention, were now still further changed by the insertion into their contents of a confused jumble of the lives and miracles of saints, and extracts from the writings, real or suppositious, of the fathers, so that the reading of the Scriptures was really null in one set of the services, and only this miserable substitute for it given in the other, and thus the whole ancient system of Bible lessons

was virtually abolished in the Western Church for centuries.

Under these conditions, when the English reformers of the sixteenth century wished to introduce the reading of the Scriptures in their completeness again into the worship of the Church, they restored the epistle and gospel in the Liturgy to the people by translating them into the mother tongue; and dropping the mythical saints' legends and patristic homilies from the daily offices, they appointed in their stead as an integral portion of every morning and evening prayer, and for all the "ordinary worship" of the Sundays and Holy Days, the regular and systematic reading of the "Oracles of God."

The reform thus made in these services by the introduction of 'lessons' from the Bible in place of their previous readings, was of itself of inestimable value to the worship of the Church; but this was by no means the only matter in which these offices changed in so many features from their primitive use, now needed to be revised.

As the Western Church had become gradually corrupted by the sacerdotal theory, and thus had perverted the Liturgy and the Eucharistic Sacrament from their original conception of a spiritual communion to that of a priestly sacrifice, the other offices and ministrations were, of course, correspondingly modified.

Among these the daily services, as we have already indicated, had undergone changes which gave them so widely different a character and use from that which had belonged to them in the primitive ages, that after a time they, too, like the Eucharist, came to be regarded

as almost exclusively a priestly function, and to be considered efficacious, not so much because the people were present and made the thoughts and words of the services their own, as because they were said by a priest, and that, in his saying them, he performed a priestly office, which was acceptable to God and beneficial to the Church solely by reason of his office.

Along with this influence came the rise of monasticism and the rapid extension through all the Church of monastic institutions. The key-note to this whole system was that the highest life for the individual and the mightiest power for good, both to the Church and to the world, was the constant occupation in repeated acts of worship and the consequent offering in these of the Church's never-ceasing "sacrifice of praise and prayer."

Of course, both the monastic and sacerdotal developments were manifestations of the general character of Church thought and teaching in the times when they became dominant, and as the natural consequence of this universal tendency to the exaltation and increase of forms and exercises of devotion, there was an excessive multiplication throughout the Church at large, as well as in the monasteries, of all manner of religious services, whether Eucharistic, devised for some special occasion, or those of the "ordinary worship of the Church."

Instead of the two or three offices of daily service, with their simple and yet inspiring forms of penitence, prayer and holy aspiration, there came to be eventually seven, eight, or, in some cases, nine offices to be said at as many appointed times of every day. Indeed,

there were monasteries of those known¹ as "sleepless monks" (Akœmeti), or monks of "perpetual adoration." In these institutions the services never ceased, the moment one ended another was begun, and thus "unbroken prayer was kept up day and night" continually.

The daily services thus multiplied are called collectively "The Hours" or "The Offices of the Hours," and the volume or set of volumes in which they are contained, with the enormously complex and elaborate directions for their performance, is known as "The Breviary."²

The breviary in its present form consists of four parts, each constituting quite a large volume, and comprising the services for the seven or eight "hours" of each day of that season of the year, to which the volume is appropriated. The series begins with the Advent, and the several parts are referred to sometimes by the name of the season of the year, as the winter part, the spring part (*pars hiemalis, vernalis*, etc.), and sometimes by numbers, as *pars prima*, etc. The offices for the several "hours" of each day consist of the psalms, verses of Scripture, saints' stories, bits of homilies, hymns, etc., appropriate to the day and time; some of these are

¹ Héfélé's "Histoire des Conciles," Vol. III, p. 275.

² All the services of the English Church are now contained in the one volume, the Prayer Book, but those of the Middle Age period, as of the Roman communion at the present time, were so elaborate and complex that they required many separate volumes. The chief of these were the four volumes of the daily offices which, taken as a whole, is called, although the etymology of the word is uncertain, the Breviary. The Missal is the volume which contains the Liturgy in all its various forms, and corresponds to our Communion office with the collects, epistles, gospels, etc., though vastly more extensive than our order.

printed in their place in full, and some to be found by reference to the Rubrics and tables given with the several parts, and "if it is remembered that nearly every day in the year was dedicated to some saint, and that a varying amount of respect was shown to these saints, it will be seen that, as the Sundays and other movable feasts fell on this or that saint's day, the confusion between the various services belonging to the same day must have been very great.¹ The complication of festivals under the Sarum use was so great that there were no less than twenty-five degrees of importance assigned to them, and for the assistance of the reader, whose duty it was to find out how the service for any particular day was to be arranged, directions were minutely given in thirty-five tables, commonly named *Pica Sarum*, or 'the rules called the pie.'"

The form which these services ultimately assumed was the growth of centuries, and, as a consequence, embraced elements the most diverse and incongruous. In their original design they presented an ideal of self-sacrifice the most sublime and worship the most exalted; and in a large portion of their contents were the expression of as lofty piety and pure devotion as have been ever felt by man. Much of all that is best and noblest in the religious language of the English speaking world to-day owes its origin to those earnest souls, who wrought their lives into the prayers and chants which were translated into our daily offices, and the sublime thoughts which we have preserved in the fervid though severe perfection of the collects

¹ Burbidge on the Liturgies, etc., p. 144.

of our Communion service. And we still hold these priceless treasures as our own, and use them with thankful hearts as a portion of our inheritance in the past ages of the Church.

At the same time, along with so much that is good and beautiful, we find the influence of certain false and perverting principles at work, which interwove throughout these services the wildest legends of the lives of saints who never lived, miracles of martyrs and confessors, too puerile and unmeaning, one would think, for even an age of the direst superstition, and the invocation of hosts of angelic or departed spirits, many of whom had no existence save in the name by which their assistance was implored. And all this was elaborated into tangled forms and wearisome repetitions, which made a knowledge of them an utter impossibility for the lay folk,¹ and hardly to be mastered by the lifetime study of the clergy.

The excessive multiplication and the complexity of the festival and ordinary offices which had thus grown up around the daily services, in connection with the opinions held concerning the higher importance and benefit of "hearing Mass," had resulted many centuries before the Reformation in the almost utter abandonment of these services by the laity. In fact, they were seldom performed² regularly as offices in the Church, except in the monasteries, and even in them the sev-

¹ Dixon, "History of the Church of England," Vol. II, p. 312: "Every priest found himself bound by his book to go through a daily routine of prayer, which it was impossible even to pretend to observe."

² Burbidge, *ut sup.*, p. 122: "When the obligation of saying the daily offices (the eight or nine hours) began to be enforced, it is evident the burden of reciting them publicly was more than could be

eral "hours" were often so run together as virtually to make but two or three services in the day, instead of the regular number of the "canonical hours" at the times appointed for them; while the parish clergy, although bound under severe threatenings to repeat to themselves in private each day the entire "breviary" of that day, performed only a small part, and in many cases none of it at all in the public church.

Such was the condition of the daily services at the period of the Reformation, and the necessity for a return, with respect to them, to the "godly and decent order of the "ancient fathers" was one of the demands that pressed most urgently on the revisers of the English Prayer Book. Not only was it required because of the importance of the elements which belonged to these offices in their original intent and use, but still more because the reformers deemed it of essential moment to restore to the Church the character of "common worship," and the vital connection of the laity with the service of the Church which had been so fatally obscured by the priestly exclusiveness of the Mass, as it had been perverted, and the withdrawal of all those "common" offices in which the laity once had so chief a part.

To bring back these services to the people in their original character and use was, accordingly, a most im-

borne, and private recitation of the hour services was universally accepted as sufficient."

Pelliccia (Romanist), *ut. sup.*, p. 213: "After the ninth century the public psalmody of the Church was only kept up on the more solemn and important festivals of the year. After the twelfth century even this remnant of ancient discipline seems to have been abolished, and the clergy, for the future, recited the service of psalmody in private."

portant feature in the great task of the reformers, and no portion of the work of Cranmer and his associates has been of more abiding and essential value than the mode in which they dealt with these offices, and the form in which they have given them to the Church of England and the world.

With these daily services, as with the Liturgy, the purpose was not in any sense to construct or compile a new set of offices, nor to inaugurate new types of public worship among the people. The English bishops and their co-laborers at this period did not share the feelings of Calvin and the Swiss reformers, who desired to wipe out all traces of the old historic traditions and rebuild the Church entirely on their own conception and interpretation of the Bible. On the contrary, the aim of the leaders of the reformed movements in the Church of England was steadily to hold fast to primitive antiquity in its historical connections as well as to Bible truth. Hence, instead of abolishing the existing forms of daily prayer, or moulding them over into some strange and modern combination, their action was simply to purify and utilize them, and to restore them, so far as possible, to their ancient form and primitive design.

This was done by condensing the existing seven or eight offices again into the original two, one for the morning prayer or matins and the other for the vespers or evening prayer, and putting into these whatever of the several "Hours" seemed best fitted for the place. The order of the parts¹ in each of these

¹ "The exact order of such elements or parts of the old services as they retained they preserved inviolate, and that without a single exception."—Freeman's "Divine Service," Vol. I, p. 9.

services followed that of the corresponding offices in the breviary; the only important variations from these were the omission of the prayers and invocations of the saints, along with their lives or legends, and the selections from the fathers, and with this the extension of the scant Bible readings into a regular and continued series of lessons embracing the entire Holy Scriptures, the whole of the services being rendered into that exquisite devotional English of which Cranmer, beyond all men of his own, or we may say of any age, was the most consummate master.

Collier well describes the work thus done by the reformers when he says, "Their business was only to 'brighten up what had been tarnished by time, to discharge the innovations of later ages, and to bring 'things up to the primitive standard ;' and Freeman¹ declares of them and their labors, "They expected 'the people and Church of the day to accept these 'services as essentially and for all practical purposes 'the same services revised; and what is more, the 'Church and people did manifestly so accept them. 'So clear were the revisers on this point that Cranmer "(as Jeremy Taylor has recorded, Vol. III, p. 922) "offered to prove, 'That the Order of the Church of 'England, set out by authority by Edward the Sixth, "was the same that had been used in the Church for "fifteen hundred years past.'"

It is this same ancient form, as restored by the English reformers in their final revision of 1552, that we have adopted in all its essential features for our service

¹ "Divine Service," Vol. I, p. 8.

in the ordinary worship of this Church at the daily morning and evening prayer. Hence this, too, like our Liturgy, is in all its important features of both material and purpose the "common prayer of the Church," which came to Britain with its first Christian teachers, and through them goes back to the Church and the worship of the age of the Apostles.

We have shown in the preceding pages that the return of the English and American Offices of daily service to their primitive forms gave back to these portions of the Church the element of "common" worship, which was so wholly thrust in the background by the sacerdotal theology of the Middle Ages. But there was another part of public service which was also practically lost to the people from this same influence, and which has been restored to its original place and purpose in our present "Order."

I refer to the penitential introduction, consisting of the Scripture verses, exhortation, confession and prayer, or "declaration of absolution," with which we begin both our morning and our evening prayer, and which has relations so wide and important outside the mere structure of the offices themselves as to require a special consideration.

None of these formulæ were in the Prayer Book of 1549. The daily services in this volume began at "the Lord's Prayer" (called the Pater Noster) of the present offices, but in the "second book of Edward VI, that of 1552," the penitential elements were introduced, essentially as we have them now, into the "Morning order," with a Rubric directing them to be said "at the beginning of both the morning prayer

and likewise of evening;" and in 1662 they were, for the first, printed out in full as a part of the evening office.

This change in the "Book of 1552" has been attributed by many to the influence of the Continental reformers, and regarded as a departure from the character properly belonging to these services.

But from the accounts left us of the primitive daily offices we know that they always began with a fervid confession made by all the faithful who were present, and that every one was expected to make the words used in these forms the expression of his own repentance. Hence this feature of our service, so far from being an innovation of the sixteenth century, is simply the restoration¹ of one of their original elements "to its ancient usual place," and the early offices "are in this respect the lineal progenitors of our own." Indeed, it is also true, as Freeman says in this same connection, that "there is no fault or break in the series; however considerable the changes from time to time made, the continuity and essential identity are perfect." The forms of confession and absolution had never been really lost to the services of the English Church; fragments of them are found through all the centuries in certain of the "Hours" and also as a part of the Office for the Mass, but it was with them as with so many other things, the primitive ideas were preserved in words in the several services with more or less completeness, while by the theology of the later times they had become utterly perverted from their original intention;

¹ Freeman's "Divine Service," Vol. I, pp. 62, 73, 105, 309.

and as the absolute necessity of *private* confession and absolution for salvation was finally incorporated into the doctrine of the Western Church, this came, of course, to be regarded as the only mode possessed of any efficacy, and "the public absolutions" (or apologies, as they were sometimes called) "did not reckon for much, or were applicable only to venial sins," in fact, were not considered as real absolutions at all.

Hence the change wrought by those who prepared the Book of 1552 was not in the introduction of a confession and absolution into the daily services—such had, in one form or another, always¹ entered into some part of them—but in the restoration of these acts again to the full and proper significance they had possessed in the early ages of the Church, and the return thus made to the Scriptural and primitive truth of their entire sufficiency "for the absolution and remission of the sins of all those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel."

The view of confession thus embodied in the daily services in 1552 was, however, essentially the same as that presented from the very beginning in the vernacular offices of the English revisers. It was involved in the addition made for lay communion to the Latin Mass in 1548. It was continued in substance the same in the Liturgy of 1549; and the difference as to this matter between this book and that of 1552 was rather in

¹ "Catholic (Roman) Dictionary," p. 6: "Certain short prayers said before the lessons in matins (and in prime), express or imply petitions for forgiveness of sin, and this probably explains the name absolution which has been given to such prayers or blessings." Maskell's "Ancient English Liturgies," p. 15: "In the most ancient offices we find forms of confession and absolution before the most solemn part of the Liturgy."

the part of the service in which it was presented than in any principle implied.

The precise terms in which these successive offices express their thought will be given further on; but in order to understand the position of the English Church on this important subject, and the somewhat different expressions of our own offices where it is involved, it will be necessary to give a short outline of the history of confession in the Western Church, and the main features of the doctrine at the time of the Reformation.

There is no evidence from either allusions in the fathers, or the testimony of historians, that the primitive Church had any conception of the necessity of private confession and individual priestly absolution (what in Roman theology is called sacramental confession) as an element of Christian life or discipline for all its members. Nor do we find that, as a matter of usage, any private confession was universally, or even very frequently, practiced during the first several centuries.

For all ordinary sins, or such as did not call for special notice and discipline, the only thing that was expected, or was actually done, was the sincere and fervid application by each offender of the general confession and prayer for forgiveness contained in the daily offices and in the Liturgy, to his own personal transgressions and needs. If there were individual confessions (and doubtless many in every age of the Church have felt a need to "open their grief" to "a minister of God's Word" for his "counsel and advice"), they were in every case entirely¹ voluntary,

¹ Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer, "Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England," p. 26: "Whatever may have been the amount

made only by such as required some peculiar comfort or guidance from their spiritual teacher, and in no sense or mode were they regarded as a constant part of the Christian life, or even a customary¹ element of Christian self-cultivation, and certainly *in no case* as a means for obtaining private, authoritative priestly absolution.

When, however, one of the "faithful" had committed some flagrant sin which brought scandal on the Church and on himself as a Christian, he was required, unless he followed up his offence by separating himself entirely from the membership of the Church, to undergo a regular and appointed course of penitential discipline before he could be allowed to share again in the full privileges of the "faithful."

The discipline provided for such cases was that the offender should make a public confession of his sin in the presence of the whole congregation of the "faithful," and before the bishop and his council of presbyters; Upon the confession thus made, the bishop, and never any but the bishop, pronounced, in the same public presence, a sentence of exclusion from the Holy Eu-

of frequency with which private confession was practiced, it is clear that with the exception, at least, of overt and grievous sins, to which public discipline properly applied, it was *strictly voluntary*;" p. 24: "Private confession (when made) was only in connection with the public discipline, and *not as a means of private absolution*;" p. 47: "The modern practice of private penance was unknown to the ancients."

¹ "History of the Confessional," by John Henry Hopkins, D.D., Bishop of Vermont, p. 94: "Of the modern Roman confessional, with its private and secret penance and absolution, the fathers appear to have had no conception."

"Dictionary Christian Antiquities" (where full authorities are given), pp. 645, 1587, 1760.

charist for a period corresponding to the gravity of the offence. The length of this deprivation depended, at first, entirely on the judgment of the bishop,¹ but somewhat later on the time during which he was to be excluded for all the more important sins likely to call for discipline was rigidly fixed by the Canons which governed the churches in the different localities or provinces. During the period of "separation" from the Communion the offender was expected to give himself earnestly to repentance and prayer, and the Church constantly offered up, in its Liturgy, most fervid supplications for those who were under its sentence.

At the end of the time for which the penitent had been excluded, he came again before the congregation and the bishop, and the latter, after devout prayer for his forgiveness and perfect acceptance with God, declared him restored once more to the privilege of the Communion, and to all the other blessings which belonged to one of the faithful.

In the system of penitential discipline thus held by the

¹ Pelliccia's "Polity," etc., pp. 401, 402: "The administration of the "Sacrament of Penance rested altogether with the bishop." "Accordingly in former times it was to him that individual penitents confessed their sins." But, while they confessed to the bishop, it was always in public and before the congregation; p. 404: "In former times this confession was not made to one bishop only, or to one priest only, but to the whole presbytery, which used, together with him, to receive confessions and to impose penance; and the laity were also present as witnesses."

The penance of these early ages consisted in the exclusion of the offender for a longer or shorter time from the Communion, and canons specifying the period for different offences are found in every collection, from the Apostolic canons until this primitive system had been displaced by the later theories of absolution, etc.

early Church, and so ministered for several centuries, we note: 1. For all the ordinary sins of the Christian the only confession required, or even contemplated, was the personal self-examination, repentance and prayer provided for in the public services of the Church; and that the obligation of universal, private confession, with a view to authoritative priestly absolution, was wholly unknown and unthought of in the primitive ages of the Church.

2. When the offence was of such grievous wickedness as to require the exercise of discipline, the disciplinary confession was, during all these centuries, made, never to a priest and in private, but to the bishop, in public, before the body of the faithful with its presbyters.

3. As the confession must be made to the bishop, so the time of exclusion was pronounced by the bishop, and in no case could the penitent be absolved and restored *until the end of the full time appointed him*, and then, not by a priest, but only by the bishop who imposed the penalty,¹ or his regular successor. The primitive Church knew nothing, in either theory or practice, of a power of authoritative absolution inherent in the priesthood by virtue of their office, for, as a simple matter of fact, the presbyters of the Church for several centuries were not allowed to exercise the prerogative of reconciliation or absolution at all.

¹ Synod of Elvira, Canon LIII. Heféle's "Histoire des Conciles," Vol. I, p. 156: "If any other bishop than the one by whom he had been excommunicated should presume to readmit him," such bishop was deserving the severest censure.

This was reaffirmed at Nice, Canon V, and provision made for appeal to a synod of the province in case any injustice had been practiced by "the bishop."

4. When the penitent, at the end of his time of exclusion, came before the bishop to be restored, the mode of his reconciliation was not by the indicative, "I absolve thee;" that form was not adopted by any part of the Church for over one thousand years, and is still unused by the Easterns.

The form always employed was a prayer, and on the utterance of that the Divine answer was assumed as fulfilling what had been promised to the penitent, and the absolution and restoration to communion was complete.

The first notable invasion on the primitive principle that the bishop was, by virtue of his office, the one with whom the administration of penance and restoration to Communion altogether rested, was "in consequence of the fierceness of the Decian persecution." It was found at that time "that the bishop alone was not sufficient for this office." So many of those who "lapsed" or fell back into paganism during its continuance, afterward desired to confess, submit to the appointed discipline, and be restored to the communion of the faithful, that the bishops began to delegate presbyters to aid them in this work.¹

Shortly after this time and for some centuries later on we find canons passed allowing others than bishops to administer absolution² in cases of great danger or

¹ Pelliccia, pp. 457, 458. After some centuries "we find the bishop giving this right, to reconcile a penitent, to a presbyter, or, in the absence of a presbyter, to a deacon, if the man was near death. The presbyters reconciled penitents only by virtue of a delegated right. The right of reconciling penitents, except in case of necessity, was withheld by the early fathers *equally from presbyters and from deacons.*"

² Canons of Elvira, XXXII (Héféle's "Histoire," etc., Vol. I, p. 147).

imminent death; under such conditions presbyters, deacons, and even monks, who at this period were yet mostly laymen, could perform the office of uttering the prayer in which was conveyed the reconciliation and absolution which the dying penitent desired. But the proviso was always added or implied that if the person should recover he must go to the bishop by whom the penance had been imposed, and through the laying on of his hands receive the confirmation of the absolution, and, also, if any portion of the time appointed for his penance yet remained unfulfilled, he must complete this to the full before he could be readmitted to the actual communion of the Church.

Hence it is evident that the power of absolution was not regarded by the primitive Church, nor even by the mediæval Church for many centuries, as an authority inherent in the priesthood, nor one which simply as priests they were allowed to exercise; for a long period

Héféle adds, "This Canon is entirely in conformity with the ancient custom, according to which only a bishop and not a priest could receive a penitent into the Church again. It was only in case of extreme necessity (*cogente tamen infirmitate, etc.*) that a priest, or, under certain conditions, even a deacon was allowed this power."

Nice, Canon XIII, orders that the bishop shall administer the Eucharist to any one truly penitent and in danger of death, and also that "if he should not die after having been absolved and admitted to Communion, he must be placed again among those who take part in prayer" (*i. e.*, must fulfil his appointed time of exclusion).

And the Synod of Orange decrees (A.D. 441), "If any sick persons who have received Communion should recover, they must continue yet in their place as penitents, and not be fully reconciled by the laying on of the hand (of the bishop) until they have fully completed the penance appointed them." Héféle's "Histoire," etc., Vol. II, p. 474. Bingham, XIX, p. 2, § 4.

it was wholly forbidden them, when they were first permitted to employ it, it was simply as delegates and to aid the bishop, and in this capacity they shared it with the deacon and the yet lay monk, and when the peril of death did call on them to use it, this prerogative was so little an essential of their order that it needed the confirmation of a bishop for its completeness if the person recovered.

As it was many centuries before the authoritative administration of penance came to be regarded as an inherent prerogative of the priesthood,¹ so was it a long process before it became a fixed law that every member of the Church must make a personal, private confession to a priest.

Testimonies abound in most of the fathers for the first six hundred years and more, that however salutary for personal self-discipline confession to a minister, with penance and prayer by him for forgiveness, might be to the individual Christian, it was not even thought of as a matter of necessary and constant ob-

¹ The assertion in the Roman Ordinal of a special power in the priesthood to forgive sins dates only from the twelfth century, when the clause was first introduced, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained" [John xx, 23], and the words construed to mean the inherent power in the priesthood of authoritative absolution.

Pelliccia, p. 50, says these words "are wanting in rituals more ancient than the twelfth century, and, perhaps, only began to be generally used after the sixteenth century."

Blunt's "Annotated Prayer Book," p. 563: "The actual words are first found in a book belonging to Mayence, of the thirteenth century. No allusion to them in the ancient rituals."

Haddon on "Apostolical Succession," etc., p. 250: "A form which is not in the Eastern ordinals."

ligation on all members of the Church, still less was it regarded, as in any sense whatever, a requirement upon whose fulfillment salvation must depend.

Several Canons, also, of important Councils show this to have been the case. One from the Second Council of Chalons, in France, as late as 813, indicates very clearly the mind of the Church upon this subject, and at the same time marks the beginning of the tendencies which finally culminated in the full mediæval doctrine of sacramental confession. This Canon declares,¹ "Some say they ought to confess their sins to God only, some think they are to be confessed unto the priests, both of which, not without great fruit, are practiced in the Holy Church, for the confession which is made to God purges the sins, and that made to the priest teaches how the sins should be purged." Note here with reference to the form this doctrine afterward assumed the effects assigned to the two modes of confession—that "to God purgeth away the sins"—he who truly confesses to God needs no absolution from the lips of man; that "to the priest teacheth how the sins should be purged," that is, enables him to guide and direct and discipline the penitent where he may need it to a

¹ Heféle's "Histoire," etc., Vol. V, p. 188.

In a collection of English canons about 994 A.D. (Johnson's "Canons," Vol. I, p. 469) confession is treated of at considerable length. Canon XXX says, "After confession, with groaning, etc., we should pray for our self to the Lord, for confession contributes to our good inasmuch that by ghostly advice received from the priest and medicine for those blemishes which we confess to be in us by means of our own deeds, and by observing the injunctions he gives us we may blot out our sins, etc." "Not one word here," says Johnson, "of the benefits of the priest's absolution."

higher spiritual life. There is as yet no word nor hint of the necessity of confession to salvation, or that it is an essential element of Christian life and culture.

“So,” says the author of the article on Exomologesis (confession) in the “Dictionary of Christian Antiquities” (p. 647), “it remained an open question for the next three hundred years,” and in fact the obligation and necessity of private confession and absolution did not become the law of the Western Church, nor even its universal usage, until in 1215 the Fourth Council of the Lateran¹ ordained, “That all the faithful of each sex after coming to years of discretion shall confess their sins in private at least once in the year to their own priest.” So late and modern, and so little entitled to be called primitive or Catholic is this practice, which is now declared to be essential to the salvation of every human soul.

About the beginning of this same century, the thirteenth, the Western part of the Church also finally discarded the primitive form of effecting the reconciliation and absolution of the penitent by prayer, and substituted in place of it the positive or indicative declaration “I absolve thee,” etc., which has since continued to be the form in the Roman communions.

The “Catholic Dictionary” (p. 645) says that

¹ Héfélé's “Histoire des Conciles,” Vol. VIII, p. 133, Canon XXI.

Rev. T. T. Carter (of Clewer) says of this: “The first material innovation on the practice of antiquity purposely introduced was the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council of A.D. 1215, which established the absolute necessity of periodical confession as a condition of continued fellowship with the Church. This decree was enforced by severe penalties, excommunication and the denial of Christian burial.” “On Doctrine of Confession,” p. 48.

"Morinus has shown, indeed demonstrated, that down to the twelfth century absolution was always given among the Latins in a precatory form. This same precatory form still continues to be used, as it has from the beginning by the Greeks." Thomas Aquinas, writing about the middle of the thirteenth century, although contending that the proper form of absolution should be "*ego te absolvo*," etc., yet admits that "Christ did not institute this form, neither was it even then in common use (*Christus non legitur hanc formam instituisse, neque etiam in communi usu habetur*¹)."

The first requirement for its use in the English Church was in the year 1268. It was then introduced by Othobon, a legate from the Bishop of Rome, who was allowed by the weakness of Henry III to hold a council as Papal Legate in London, but of whom John Johnson says,² "His coming hither was for very good cause much resented by all degrees of Churchmen;" but being supported by the king, who wished to use the power of the Pope to extort money from the clergy, he induced or constrained the Council to approve certain ordinances agreeable "to the chief pontiffs and the legates of the Apostolic see," which are known as

¹ Aquinas, Summa, Part III, Quest. LXXXIV, Art. 3.

² Johnson's "English Canons," Vol. II, pp. 215, 211.

Carter (of Clewer) says, p. 49 (ut sup.), "There is a remarkable similarity between the changes which took place (in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries) in the ministry of penance and the more eventful developments affecting the Holy Eucharist. In both cases alike the transition was gradual and at first almost imperceptible."

And he might have added with truth, in both cases the result was alike the destruction of Catholic doctrine and Catholic usages, and the substitution in their stead of principles and practices wholly mediæval and unscriptural.

"The Constitutions of Othobon." In the second of these we find the new formula and the equally new doctrine of authoritative priestly absolution enforced together upon the Church and people of England; its language is, "Let all who hear confessions expressly absolve their penitents by pronouncing the under-written words: 'By the authority of which I am possessed I absolve thee from thy sins.'"

The general history of the transition from the primitive to the mediæval form is given very clearly, and shown to be in substantial accord with the above statements by the Roman writer on Church Polity already cited. Pelliccia (English Translation, pp. 460, 461): "Respecting the absolution itself, which the ancients "used during long centuries, even down to the end of "the Middle Ages, it was not declaratory (*indictiva*) "as it is now, but deprecatory;" and after quoting at some length from fathers who declare that the penitent is absolved by "prayers appointed by Christ," and that it is by "the Holy Ghost sins are forgiven," he adds, "All the ministerial office consists in prayers; "the ministers of penance ask and God forgives." "For a very long time indeed, the (Western) Church "continued to use this precatory absolution. We "have the distinct testimony of St. Bernard that, as "regards the twelfth century, this was the doctrine "held at that time, but then by degrees the one was introduced which is imperative in form," "and in the thirteenth century the imperative form, which we now use, was generally adopted in the Latin Churches," while "the Greek Church, on the other hand, has kept to the deprecatory form from the earliest ages even to our

own day;" so that in the primitive Church, and through all those ages which properly determine what is *Catholic doctrine* and *Catholic usage*, the power of pronouncing authoritative, private, positive absolution in the terms now claimed as Catholic, or, indeed, in any terms at all, was utterly unknown and unthought of. And during all the earlier centuries of the Church, certainly for six or seven hundred years, absolution in any form was not regarded as a power inherent in the priestly office, or as an act which a priest had authority to perform at all, otherwise than by a delegated power from the bishop, and as his assistant or in his stead, and for some imminent or specified necessity.

The form which the doctrine of penance, however, finally assumed was, like every other element of Church thought and life during the Middle Ages, changed very widely from its primitive type by the influence of the political and social conditions of that period.

From the middle of the fifth century, and for five hundred years thereafter, a continued series of invasions, conquests and settlements of hosts of Northern barbarous peoples had wiped out of existence through all Western Europe every trace of that vast fabric called the Roman Empire, and on its ruins had established a score of petty barbarian kingdoms, each struggling with brutal ferocity to secure what it had grasped, or to subject to its dominion as many of the provinces of its neighboring fellow-robbers as it was able to overcome.

Each of these foreign communities brought with it the coarse, rude, barbarian laws, opinions and usages which belonged to the wild, untutored state in which

they had all lived in their native forests, and of necessity these were intermingled through the old Roman thought and customs in all the various provinces of the West which they conquered and occupied, and constituted an important element in all the new nations they founded.

The only institution of the ancient world that maintained itself as a living power through this chaotic period was the Christian Church, and with it the mighty influence of the Christian faith, worship and law. The Church, of course, like all else in that fearful time, suffered terribly from the calamities that then overspread the world, but by the divineness of its nature, the power of its truths, the fervor of its ministry, and the spirit and holy lives of multitudes who sacrificed themselves to make its blessings known to their rude and often cruel conquerors, it not only withstood the long perils of these destroying invaders, but by its mighty influence it rose supreme in the end above all these hostile agencies, and became in its sphere and for its great purposes the spiritual conqueror and master of one and all of the new nations which these wild Gothic tribes were thus forming as the germ of modern Europe.

But although the Church did become eventually, both as an organism and in its essential principles, dominant over these new and barbarian peoples, it was also, in its turn, largely influenced, and in some very important matters much perverted by the conceptions and institutions which these strange and foreign races and communities had brought with them, and some of which remained for centuries as integral elements of their religious and social life.

The coarse, uncultivated minds of peoples such as these were wholly incapable of apprehending a truly spiritual religion, or of conceiving the possibility of agencies and results which concerned themselves wholly with the spiritual realities of the Divine nature, or the corresponding relations in the life of man. Accordingly, the doctrines of the Church were, in the very nature of the case, and as history abundantly testifies, now moulded into forms and associated with principles which could be appreciated by these peoples and made effective in their control.

It is true this period is often highly vaunted as "an age of faith," a time when men lived in "the habitual presence of the world of spirits." So far as the mere words may go this undoubtedly was so. It was an age of superstition and credulity. Everybody believed in signs and miracles and terrors, but at the same time it was an age of the most universal and unqualified materialism, for what they called "spirits" were only beings of a more subtle and potent material substance than ourselves. The joys of eternal blessedness consisted essentially in material delights. Hell was a physical torture by fire "corporeal" in its nature, and of the "same species"¹ as the fire of earth. Christ could be "really present" only in a body to which belongs "whatsoever pertains to the character of a true

¹ Thomas Aquinas, Summa, Part III, Qu. XCVII, Art. 5: "They, the damned, *punientur igne corporeo.*"

Ib., Qu. XCVII, Art. 5: "*Quocumque ignis inveniatur* (speaking of the fire of the damned) *semper est idem in specie quantum ad naturam ignis pertinet; potest autem esse diversitas in specie quantum ad corpora quae materia ignis sunt,*" and concludes that whatever be the difference in the matter, all fire is of the same species.

body, such as bones and nerves ; ” and purgatorial punishment could be satisfied for, and virtually paid off, portion by portion, as any other commodity that could be measured and valued and paid for by material currency.

There were, we know, lofty souls, and in great numbers, too, who through all these transition centuries of destruction and re-formation dwelt apart from the mechanical ideas of religion which this spirit had evolved, in a high and holy mysticism, in which the limits between the human and divine seemed to have melted away, and like Enoch of old, “ they walked with God ; ” and there was on every hand, too, deep and fervid piety, lives battling with sin, and even under the grossest of these forms receiving from the Divine Spirit the power to bear them onward in their sore conflict with evil.

But however spiritual and exalted may have been the personal lives of hosts of individuals in the Church, its doctrines, services and practices were all being moulded more and more in accord with the prevailing material and mechanical conceptions ; and the result of this infusion into the Church of these elements from the thought and life of its barbarian new subjects, themselves in time becoming its ministers and thinkers, was the gradual transformation of the primitive doctrines and worship into the mediæval or sacerdotal system of theology and ritual which eventually became the dominant theory of the Western Church, and was finally crystallized into the authoritative dogma of the Roman Communion by the canons and decrees of Trent.

The materializing characteristics of this barbarian

influence affected, more or less extensively, every portion of the doctrine and service of the Church, but they were nowhere shown more markedly than in the matter of the penitential discipline, which, in the latter portions of the Middle Ages, was imposed upon the people in place of the opinions and practice of the early centuries.

We have already seen that confession, instead of remaining voluntary, or continuing to be practiced as a part of the public service of the Church, had been made an obligation required of every member of the Church by law and penalty; that "reconciliation" was no longer effected through prayer and by a bishop, but that "authoritative absolution" was now regarded as an inherent attribute of the office of a priest; that it was not required now that the appointed time of exclusion from Communion should be fulfilled before the offender could be restored, but he was absolved by his priest immediately on the confession, and reconciled at once on his promise to perform the penance imposed on him.

This last departure from the primitive mode of discipline was not admitted without a clear understanding of its import on the part of many who for a time opposed it, and even protested strenuously against its introduction. The 11th Canon of the Third Synod of Toledo¹ (A.D. 589), declares: "In some Churches in Spain an abuse has been introduced into (the manner of administering) penance; this is, that persons sin entirely at their ease (*seul à son aise*) and constantly come back to the

¹ Héfélé's "Histoire," etc., Vol. III, p. 592.

“priest to demand reconciliation. This abuse ought
“to cease, and, agreeably to the ancient canons, who-
“ever repents of an offence should be immediately ex-
“cluded from the Communion, and then should present
“himself frequently to receive imposition of hands.
“When his time of penance is fulfilled, he can then, if
“the bishop think it right, be readmitted to the Com-
“munion. But if during the period of his penance
“or even after it, he fall again into his old sin, he shall
“undergo the penalties of the ancient canons.”

The usage pointed out and deprecated in this Canon was, however, so wholly in accord with the general spirit of the period that it was, after a time, extended throughout the Western Church. And with it came also conceptions of penance and modes of dealing with offences derived from the barbarians, which in the end destroyed almost entirely, in the popular mind at least, the early and Scriptural idea of sin and repentance, and substituted the mechanical or pecuniary fulfilment of a penance as a means of obtaining forgiveness and release from the penalty of sin instead of the uplifting of the soul to Christ, a surrender of the life to Him, and thus practically transferred the office of pardoning sin from a loving act of God to the official utterance of a priest, and gave to a man and his word a power that could belong only to God.

The Gothic peoples, in all their branches, were accustomed, as an essential element of their modes of punishment, to have a money (or money's worth) value attached to almost every offence or crime, and the person who was guilty of a wrong could buy it off by the payment himself, or the union of friends with him, of

the mulct affixed to the offence. Little by little this principle came to be applied to the penances imposed by the priests, and as Pelliccia says, "in mediæval times there gradually grew up that new system called "the discipline of redemption," *i.e.*, the imposed penance could be bought off by alms, "and besides this, in every parish it began to be the custom for penitents to pay the "enjoined penance" (p. 445). "The Catholic Dictionary," (p. 652) explains this somewhat more fully: "The practice had arisen of procuring exemption from "canonical penance by giving alms, etc. This custom "is mentioned and condemned by an English Council "held in 747" [see Johnson's "Canon," Vol. I, p. 256], "and it was generally recognized in the ninth century; but from the end of the tenth or opening of the "eleventh century penances due to sins were arithmetically computed, that is, if seven years of penance "were assigned for committing a sin once, twenty-one "years were reckoned as the penalty due for committing it three times; and large alms, flagellations and "recitations of the Psalter were accepted as a redemption of the penance. Thus Peter Damiani tells the "story of a man who by cruel flagellation and frequent "recitations of the Psalter accomplished a hundred "years of penance in six days."

In England we find the whole system applied with abundant variety and fulness of detail to almost every possible condition, whether of the offence or the offender. In a Code of Canons of the date 963, and which Johnson thinks (Vol. I, p. 426) "might be called Archbishop Dunstan's Penitential," we find almost every kind of crime provided for that could come under canonical dis-

cipline, with elaborate directions as to the kind of penance and the number of years during which it must be continued, assigned to each; but in the concluding sections of the code there are provisions made for a much easier and speedier fulfilment of the penance than is appointed in the several preceding canons. Section 72 is headed, "Here let us declare how infirm men may redeem their fasting," and then follow several modes, any one of which the "infirm" offender may select as best suits his wishes. "One day's fasting may be re-deemed with a penny or with two hundred psalms; "a year's fasting may be redeemed with thirty shillings," etc., etc., or "for one day's fasting let a man bow to the ground with *Pater Noster* sixty times," and so on with alternatives to suit, one would think, every possible taste and case for a considerable length.

But besides these general provisions for the ordinary sort of folk, Canon 74 appoints "How a very wealthy man and one that abounds in friends may make his satisfaction much more easy by the assistance of his friends; he must first, under the testimony of his shrift, manifest his sound faith and promise to desist," etc., and then, if the time of his penance were, say two years, "let it be thus completed in three days. Let him take to his assistance twelve men, and let them fast three days on bread, etc., and let him by all possible means procure seven times one hundred and twenty men to fast for him three days, and there are as many fasts kept as there are days in seven years."

It is unquestionably true, as Neander¹ shows very

¹ Neander's "Church History," Bohn's Edition, Vol. VII, p. 482.

fully, that thinking people and devout theologians recognized that the real value of all these forms of discipline lay "in the inward confession of sin and that "true repentance which springs from love," but it is equally evident that whatever truths the few earnest thinkers may have held regarding it, the real character and tendency of the system of "sacramental confession," as thus evolved, was mechanical and external and widely different in almost every principle and in its entire ministration from the doctrines and usages of the Church through all its early centuries, as well as all we learn concerning this matter from Holy Scriptures.

But there is yet another phase of the mediæval penitential system which is necessary to a full understanding of that system in all its bearings, and which is still further opposed, if possible, to all the Scriptural and primitive teachings on this subject than those which have been already noticed.

This was the extension of the power of the priesthood to the life beyond the grave, and with this the amazing claims that they were able to visit an offending soul with penalties in the other world by excommunication and anathema pronounced upon the dead, and also that they possessed a corresponding ability, by the mechanical acts of saying masses for the departed, or performing the work necessary to obtain an indulgence, to remove the curses they had imposed by their sentence, or to "satisfy for," and thus terminate the pains of those doomed to purgatory for "sins not yet fully expiated."

The tremendous, indeed awful, power thus claimed

by the clergy of following each soul into the other world with their excommunications and anathemas, had first come prominently before the Church in the Second Council of Constantinople (known as the Fifth General Council, A.D. 553).

It was then proposed by the Emperor Justinian, who desired to vent his wrath against certain men long dead; and whom, with their doctrines and followers, he wished to condemn to eternal torments, but as they had died in the communion of the Church, this could only be done by an excommunication and an anathema, which should penetrate with their curse into the regions of the dead, and carry their fearful sentence into execution there. The project was received at first with almost universal indignation and horror. The then Pope of Rome, Vigilius, repelled it vehemently as new, against all right, and opposed to all the past history of the Church. He said (Héféle's "Histoire des Conciles," Vol. III, p. 498), "That he had examined "with great care what his predecessors had said on the "question. Leo and Gelasius had declared expressly "against this measure, and had maintained that we "must leave the dead to the Divine Justice, and the "Roman Church had always followed this rule in her "practice," etc.

But under the pressure of imperial influence it was forced upon the Council and the anathemas pronounced (Héféle, p. 508), and after a long struggle the Pope himself recanted, and some seven months subsequent to the adjournment of the Synod approved its action in a letter (Héféle, p. 524), which declares that "the "enemy of the human race, who is everywhere sowing

"tares, had deceived him and his colleagues.¹ But "that Christ had anew chased away the darkness from "his mind, and pacified the Church in the whole world."

The doctrine once admitted was so congenial to the principles of priestly power which were now becoming dominant, that it was very rapidly and universally adopted by the clergy, and utilized in countless ways as a mighty engine of clerical authority, and means of ecclesiastical discipline or punishment.

As the excommunication, or the penalty of "yet unexpiated sin " could thus extend with their sufferings beyond the grave, there were, of course, corresponding means placed at the disposal of the Church for the mitigation² or removal of these inflictions.

¹ Héfélé, *ut sup.*: The Letter "est datée du 8 décembre 553, Cette "date nous apprend qu'il s'était passé sept mois depuis la fin du "Synode lorsque Vigile se décida à porter son jugement. Il y parle "ainsi, 'L'ennemi du genre humain, qui sème partout la zizanie l'avait "trompé, lui et ses collègues réunis à Constantinople. Mais le Christ "avait de nouveau chassé les ténèbres de son esprit, et pacifié l'église de "l'univers entier,' " etc.

² The mode in which the power of the Church is thus exerted in the regions of the dead, and also the applications that might be made of it, are both illustrated by a story which Pope Gregory I (the Great) tells of himself (*Dialogues*, Lib. IV, ch. 55, in Vol. II, p. 468).

It was against the rule of the monastery, of which Gregory was abbot, for any of its monks to have money of their own. One of the brethren being taken mortally ill, there were found upon his person, shortly before he died, three pieces of gold coin. In high indignation at this offence Gregory forbade the dying monk the last offices of the Church, and ordered his body to be cast, without the rites of burial, on a dunghill. After a month had elapsed, the abbot relented, and ordered daily masses to be offered for his absolution for the space of thirty days. In the absorbing duties of his office Gregory had, however, forgotten the flight of time, when one day a brother of the convent came to him, and

Accordingly, it was now declared that man's "temporal" condition does not end at death; it is not finally terminated till the general, last judgment. In the meantime, all who are in the Church, and it is of these only we are treating here, come to the hour of death with some, more or less, of penalty yet due for sins they have committed, and they pass into the other world with a certain quantity of this to be paid for by sufferings of corresponding length and fierceness there. Only a few of the most eminent saints die without a debt of this unliquidated punishment to be then paid off by torments or to be otherwise satisfied for through the Church's appointed means.

The place or state into which the soul thus passes to endure, by sufferings in fire, what is yet due of its "temporary punishment," is called purgatory, and it

told him that the offending brother had appeared to him in a vision, and said "that up to that day it had been very ill with him, but "now all was well, because that day he had received the Communion (*quia hodie communionem recipi*); and, on counting the time, it was "found that it was exactly the end of the thirty days for which the "masses had been directed, and thus, as the abbot sums up the incident, it appeared very clearly that the brother had been delivered "from punishment by the saving power of the Host (*quia frater qui defunctus fuerat, per salutarum hostiam, evasit suppliciem*"). And that this was the intended purpose of the story is also evident from the title of the chapter in which it is given (ch. 55), which sets forth that its subject is to show what may be done after death to aid souls in obtaining absolution; but the good Pope seems wholly oblivious of the fact that it is equally an evidence, if believed, of the frightful nature of a power which can thus visit appalling miseries by the will, even the mere caprice of a man, on souls beyond the grave. It was, in reality, the terrors of this power, and its constant exercise by the clergy, that gave its chief importance to the doctrine of sacramental absolution.

"Catechism of Trent," Donovan's Translation (Roman Catholic), p. 51.

remains there till the measure of its suffering has equaled the amount of its "temporal penalties" yet "unsatisfied," or these have been liquidated, and hence terminated through the acts appointed for that purpose by the Church on earth.

The means which are thus available for the release of a soul from its purgatorial torments are chiefly masses purchased in sufficient number by living pious friends, and indulgences granted by the Pope, or through means or persons to whom he has committed the authority for their dispensation.

So that under this enlargement of the sphere of the Church's authority the life of man here and hereafter was all in the grasp of what had thus become the tremendous power of excommunicating and absolving by the priesthood.

The efficiency of the whole system, so far as its power over the members of the Church was concerned, lay in the universal obligation which was imposed on every member of the Church by the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) to confess in private to his priest, and in the doctrine that was connected with it (which was fully elaborated and made an article of faith by the Canon and decrees of Trent, Ses. XIV, ch. 5, Canon 6) that there was no deliverance from the awful penalty of mortal sin save by this private confession to a priest, and his official and sacramental absolution conveyed in the authoritative words, "I absolve thee."

In treating of the doctrine thus set forth by the Council, the Catechism of Trent says that "confession is a sacramental accusation of one's self made with a view of obtaining pardon by virtue of the

keys" (Buckley's Translation, p. 278), and goes on to enforce the necessity of its use for salvation by the illustration that "as no one can gain admittance to a place without the aid of him to whom the keys have been committed, so again no one can gain admission into heaven unless its gates be opened by the priests to whose fidelity the Lord has confided its keys" (Buckley's Translation, p. 281).

Such were the chief elements of the mediæval doctrine of confession and absolution at the time of the Reformation. It was in most of its principles and in all of its practice a wide and irreconcilable departure from the teachings of the Scriptures and the early ages of the Church. In the strong language of Bishop Hopkins,¹ it "was without a vestige of Apostolic or "primitive sanction, and was rather to be regarded as "a system of delusion, perilous to the conscience of the "pastor and dangerous to the souls of his flock" (p. 243); and yet with all its evils it had been urged so zealously in all the teachings of the clergy that no part of the sacerdotal theology had more hold on the minds of the people in those superstitious ages than this. It was, as the Bishop truly declares, "in favor of priestly despotism," "by it the power of every priest "was fastened upon the soul and conscience of his "trembling suppliants" (p. 241), and while it remained intact any hope of permanent reform in the Church, and a return to the ancient and Scriptural teachings on the right means of obtaining forgiveness from God, would prove ill-founded.

¹ "The History of the Confessional," by John Henry Hopkins, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont, 1850, pp. 243, 241.

The revisers of the English services, at this period, fully measured the nature of the evil with which they had to deal, and they realized also that there was a need of the greatest caution, lest they might root up the wheat while cutting out the thorns, which were here so certainly "choking it."

Hence they made no direct assault, in terms, against this system, which might have provoked bitterness of response from those who held to the dominant theology, they even preserved in certain connections¹ some of the formulæ on which it had laid much stress; but by the simple process of leaving each person free to confess to God or to a minister, in public and as part of the service or in private if he felt this helpful, and by also making both the confession and the forgiveness in the one case as complete and as effective as the other, the whole priestly system was left utterly null and powerless as a system of coercion and a means of sacerdotal domination, and the primitive and Catholic principle that the only confession necessary was that made to God alone, or in the mode appointed in the

¹ This spirit is especially manifest in the retention in the English Office of the Visitation of the Sick of the positive expression, "I absolve thee," of which Bishop Hopkins speaks with great regret, calling it "this modern form of absolution," and adding (p. 242), "I cannot but lament that our noble reformers of England suffered it to remain in any part of their established offices, notwithstanding they only allowed it to be used at the earnest desire of individuals whose minds might be depressed by the weight of some especial sin."

It was, doubtless, a like feeling with this of Bishop Hopkins that led our revisers in 1789 to omit it altogether from the American Visitation Office, and either to reject or qualify the term absolution by the phrase, "a declaration," etc., wherever it has been retained in any of our offices. See Hopkins, p. 269.

Church's public service was again established in its stead.

The first step taken in the revision of the Liturgy, after the death of Henry VIII, settled the whole matter on essentially the same basis as it has ever since remained. In 1548 a short addition in English was appended to the Latin Mass, providing for the Communion in both kinds of the laity; a part of this beautiful office was "a general confession to be made in the name of all who are minded to receive the Holy Communion," etc., and after this confession the priest, turning to the people, says, "Our blessed Lord, who hath left power to His Church to absolve penitent sinners from their sins, etc., pardon you," etc.

This was designed to be, and to be used, as a full and perfect substitute for the whole scheme of individual confession to a priest and personal, authoritative absolution by him.

And that there might be no doubt of this, the priest was required to read an exhortation to the people at least one day before each Communion, which said that "if any one lacked comfort or counsel he *might* come to him, or some other discreet priest, and receive comfort and absolution," adding, however, that those who were "satisfied with a general confession should not be offended with those who use the secret confession to a priest," and those who preferred to open their sins to a priest should not take offence at others "who were satisfied with humble confession to God."

Dixon says of this (Vol. II, p. 495): "In antiquity "the confessions (or *apologiæ*) in the Mass were said "secretly by the priest and added to the clerical char-

“acter of the service,” and “this was the first open stroke that was made by authority against secret or auricular confession.”

It was, indeed, all that he asserts; but it was far more. It was an utter and intended repudiation of the whole sacerdotal system of confession and absolution, and was recognized as such.

That system held to the positive necessity for salvation of private confession and personal, authoritative absolution, the English office declared that neither was required; the priestly legislation imposed it as an universal obligation, to be enforced by penalty, for every person to confess at certain intervals to his priest, the revised form demanded only that he who choose to do this should not be molested by those who did not go; the mediæval priest, as a judge having authority, utters the positive pardon, “I absolve thee,” the English service, as the primitive Church and the Church all over the world for twelve hundred years had done, asked in prayer for pardon to the penitent, and believed God’s promise for its answer, that they who came repentant, confessing unto God their sins, would go away forgiven.

In the year following (1549) the book containing all the revised offices of the Church in their English form was issued, and was established as “The Book of the Common Prayer, etc., etc., of The Church of England.” In this the Mass service was, like all the others, reformed in accordance with the principles on which the whole revision was conducted, and became the “Holy Communion” order of the English Church; the short appendix to the Mass of 1548 was incorporated into this

office of 1549, and hence the matter of confession was left substantially, with only some slight verbal alterations, as it had been first presented in 1548.

But in the second revision, that of 1552, there were some noticeable changes in this as on many other points not, indeed, in any of the principles involved, for these were maintained the same as they had been set forth from the beginning, but in the part of the public service and in the mode in which the subject was treated.

The Communion office still retained a "general confession," etc., and had a prayer for pardon, in the ancient form, as a true absolution following it. In the exhortation, with which the Communion is announced, any one who "cannot quiet his own conscience" is told that he may "come to me or some other discreet "minister of God's Word, that he may receive such "ghostly counsel, etc., etc., as his conscience may be "relieved, and that by the ministry of God's Word he "may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution." There is no mention, however, here or elsewhere in this office, of any such general or customary use of "auricular confession," as seems to be implied in the language of 1548 and 1549.

But in lieu of any reference to the subject of auricular confession in the Communion office, the whole matter was now transferred to the daily services, and in presenting it there the position of the Church of England is declared with definite and unmistakable clearness on the whole doctrine of "sacramental confessions," and thus, virtually, on all the conclusions which the sacerdotal theology had built upon or included in it.

To this end it prefixes to the daily offices of morning and evening prayer, as they were in the book of 1549, a form of confession for all the congregation, followed by a public "absolution to be pronounced by the minister alone;" both the confession and absolution intended, as St. Basil said of the like portions of the service in the early days, to be applied by each of those present "to his own repentance."

And that there might be no doubt as to either the intent of these offices or their efficacy, the minister is directed to begin the service with certain appointed words of Holy Scripture declaring the Divine offers of forgiveness on the repentance of any sinner, and after that to read to them an exhortation which sets forth the mind and teaching of the Church on the import and full sufficiency of the confession and Divine promise of pardon which are to follow, if accompanied in the worshiper with "an humble, penitent and obedient heart."

And the chief object of the exhortation beginning "dearly beloved," etc., is not, as we are often told, to give us a little sermon on the duty and benefits of attending church; these are alluded to in a casual way, indeed, in the course of the exhortation; but its pervading purpose, as will be evident on a careful reading, is to declare in the most unmistakable and authoritative manner that the only confession that man in his ordinary life requires is to "Almighty God" alone; that this may be done anywhere and in any mode; but nowhere is it more effectual than when we are assembled as His children in His Church; then ought we "chiefly so to do;" and

when we have with fitting repentance so confessed them there, we there "obtain forgiveness of the same by His infinite goodness and mercy." The whole tenor of this declaration is to assert, upon the basis of Holy Scripture, the efficiency of confession to God alone; and the absolution that follows it enforces this assurance by its declaration that as "God hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people the absolution and remission of their sins," so "He (God) pardoneth and absolveth all them which truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel." Hence there is no necessity for priestly absolution as a private act, nor any call for "sacramental confession," as either a teaching of the Bible or a doctrine of the Church of England. She has not only avoided all reference to it as means of the needed discipline of the Christian life, but has placed in the very fore-front of her daily prayers for all time her declaration that the Church's authorized provision in her public service is abundantly sufficient for all the Christian's ordinary needs.

In the book of 1552, the form "I absolve thee," in the Office for Visitation of the Sick, etc., as given in the revision of 1549, is still retained, but with one extremely significant change in the Rubric. The office of 1549, referring to the confession of the sick person, adds, "and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions;" these words are omitted in the Rubric of 1552 and in all the later revisions; and in all the forms of "The Visitation," etc., from 1549 down, the confession of the sick, like that referred to in the Communion office, is presented

as something only desirable in peculiar and exceptional cases. In the words of Mr. Blunt ("Annotated Prayer Book," p. 284): "The Church interposes a condition, 'if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter,' which implies that only in special cases, even in sickness, is confession to be urged as absolutely necessary to the health of the soul."

There were some slight changes made in the language of the Visitation office in the several revisions from 1549 to 1662; but with the exception of the significant omission of all reference to "other private confessions" already noticed, there was no important modification of the form as given in the first Book of Edward VI.

But when the American Convention of 1789 came to deal with this subject, it made very important and most suggestive alterations in all the forms wherein confession had been mentioned in the English revisions, and all these changes were in the direction of a more thorough obliteration of what Bishop Hopkins calls "the novel additions" of the Middle Age theory (p. 241, "History of the Confessional"), and a nearer return to the primitive and Scriptural teachings on confession, etc., than had been made in the English Prayer Book.

In the warning to come worthily prepared to the Communion the words "benefit of absolution" of the English form are rejected, leaving only "that he may receive such godly counsel and advice," etc., etc. The formula, "I absolve thee," etc., and all that is connected with it, are removed from the Visitation office; while in the daily order the ancient form of a prayer,

the same as given in the Communion service, is added as an alternative to the form of the English book, and the title of the latter is changed from "The Absolution," etc., to "The Declaration of Absolution, etc., to be made by the priest alone."

The character and undoubtedly the intention of all these changes was, in connection with the historical facts,¹ "a plain condemnation by our Church of auricular confession coupled with and to obtain absolution." As has been abundantly shown, private sacramental absolution was unknown to the primitive Church; the power of absolving as an inherent function of the priesthood unheard of for centuries; the necessity of confessing to a priest at all was not imposed as a law until 1215, and the form of authoritative absolution not introduced into the West until nearly twelve hundred years after Christ, nor is it used in the Churches of the East even to-day. All these concur to prove that every change made in this matter by our offices is a nearer return to the primitive doctrine and primitive practice than the corresponding portions of the English services; hence we may truly say of the whole system of "sacramental confession," which these parts of the English book are sometimes distorted to uphold,² with Bishop Hopkins (p. 48), "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has wisely

¹ "The Ritual Law of the Church," by Murray Hoffman, p. 59.

² Of the references to confession for the obtaining of absolution in the English book, Bishop Hopkins says, p. 267: "In vain shall we endeavor to defend (its introduction into our Church) by the authority of our venerable mother, because she only permitted it under peculiar circumstances, when earnestly desired by the laity themselves, and never recommended, much less urged it."

omitted every trace of this abuse, and I rejoice that she has done so" (p. 269); "It was most wisely left out of our ecclesiastical system, and never can be grafted on it hereafter." Indeed, I cannot better conclude the whole subject than in his wise and weighty summary: "No mistake could be more fatal than to imagine that "the apathy and worldliness of the age may be removed "by urging men to confess their sins to us, and giving "them our private absolution. The remedy would "prove worse than the disease. Neither have we any "right to arrogate the prerogative of improving the "original plan of discipline." "The spirit of innovation is the spirit of the age, and we may be well "content to let it have its full range elsewhere, but we "may not suffer it to touch the work of our redemption" (p. 271). "Let us be devoutly thankful to that "almighty Saviour whose precious providence has restored to us, whole and undefiled, our Apostolic heritage" (p. 272).

The historical evidence shows clearly that we have preserved in this, as in our Liturgy and daily services, all that was essential, both in doctrine and form, of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," and hence, that in all the great lines of Church life and Church order, the Eucharist, the Common Prayer of the people, and the means of discipline of the soul, our Prayer Book has returned in all that was fundamental, to the truths of Scripture, as these were received from Christ by the Apostles, and as they were embodied and handed on by the Church, which these chosen men—filled with His Spirit—founded and taught in His name.

LECTURE IV.

THE RITUAL LAW OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH—ITS
RELATIONS TO THE PRESENT ENGLISH PRAYER
BOOK—ITS RELATIONS TO THE PRE-REFORMATION
USES AND LAW—THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF
RUBRICAL INTERPRETATION AND USE.

IN presenting the fundamental principles of the American Prayer Book as expressed on its title-page, we noted that it was declared to be "according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," and also that by "use" in this connection was meant not usage or custom, but obligatory, authoritative law.

Hence that the Prayer Book is not simply a "Directory" of general forms, to be a sort of guide to the clergy and indication to the people of the mode of service they are to perform or to expect, but that it is the law of "this Church" for all that concerns the administration of every Sacrament, or order of public worship, or other rite and ceremony which is established and set forth therein.

It is as such the people are to follow and be taught by it; as such every minister who stands beside its altar has bound himself by a solemn promise, and in his ordination vow to receive and conform to it, and as

such it is to be accepted and obeyed, both text and Rubric, in every service which it has given to perform, and in every office which it has appointed.

There is a wide-spread tendency at the present time, and from schools of theology the most diverse and even conflicting, to favor what has been speciously called "the Catholic liberty of the priest at the altar," by which is meant to claim that every minister in our Church has a right to alter, add or omit, at his will, whatever in either the language or ritual of any office he may think advisable as a matter of taste, or required for the introduction or suppression of any special doctrine, discipline of life, or mode of worship which seems to him of sufficient importance to be embodied, emphasized or discountenanced in the service as he presents this to his congregation.

Under this "liberty" one assumes that he may leave out the word "regenerate," as against his conscience, in the Baptismal Office; another that he may use the English "Te Deum," because better adapted to his favorite musical notation than the American recension; and yet others that they may interpolate an indefinite number of ceremonials into the Communion service, because they desire what they think to be a more "Catholic" mode of celebrating the Holy Eucharist than that which is appointed in our Rubrics.

It has, indeed, been confidently asserted in this connection, that the time of uniformity in the services of our branch of the Church has wholly and finally passed away, and that both the principle and practice of individual freedom in the performance of the Church's service, with no restraint from Rubric or "Use," have "come to stay."

Much of this disposition to exercise these large powers has come from the desire for a more satisfactory adaptation of our offices of worship to the special needs of this age and country than the letter of the Prayer Book seems now to grant, and is the result of a sense of the necessity that, for this purpose, the Church should allow her ministers a corresponding "flexibility" in the conduct of her services.

The American Church is certainly called to meet conditions of society and life which were wholly unknown to the framers of the Prayer Book, or to the times in which they lived; and for some of these there is no definite or really adequate provision made in the existing letter of the offices that we now have.

That we must recognize and must provide for these new needs of a great new world, by such arrangements or permission as will allow the clergy to meet them as they arise, and to minister to them as the conditions may require, there can be no doubt or reasonable question. And there is no occasion to fear but in some mode or other this will be done, and in all that is really important the requirements of our work in this respect be fully satisfied.

But while the claims for unrestrained liberty in matters of ritual are thus associated in the minds of many with these necessities of practical work, it is not chiefly in connection with this subject that the issues concerning strict obedience to the letter of the Prayer Book have been raised, nor is it with reference to this that the "ritual liberty of the priest" has been most zealously contended for.

The interests most often involved in this question,

whether on the one hand or the other, have been some phase of theological opinion, and the freedom desired has been in one direction the liberty to make the service of the Church express or emphasize certain doctrines by the introduction into its performance of some form or ceremonial which would convey the intended teaching more fully or clearly than the text or Rubric of the office, while in another line it has been with the design to remove from the service of the Church doctrines which the minister did not approve, by the omission of the words or acts in which they had been embodied from the office of which they formed a part.

In the one case as in the other the claim is, that under the ritual law of the American Church, each individual priest has the authority¹ and the right to add to or take from the text or Rubric of an office what seems to him advisable, and so to change it as to make it conform to the doctrine or the ceremonial which he thinks of sufficient importance to be thus presented.

¹ The position that entire ritual liberty is allowed to the clergy of "this Church," under its existing ecclesiastical jurisprudence, is so clearly and forcibly stated by a writer in the "Church and World," New York, October, 1874, that I cannot present the principle assumed better than by quoting from it.

"The old and original principle of American Churchmen is, that where there is no law there ought to be no transgression. This entire liberty of ritual is one of the most strikingly distinctive features of our American Church; it is peculiarly in harmony with the characteristics of the American people; it was deliberately adopted at the organization of the American Church after the Revolutionary War."

"The law of liberty of ritual is the law of this Church, which every bishop, priest and deacon of the same has bound himself to observe, obey and follow; and every bishop, presbyter or other who attempts to interfere with or restrict that liberty of ritual is a breaker of the law."

This leads to a consideration of the question, What are the relations and obligations of the members of the American Church, and especially the clergy, to its ritual as appointed in the Prayer Book?

We say "especially of its clergy," for they have the chief part in the performance of every service, and they are also the appointed stewards and teachers of the doctrines and precepts of the Church, hence, of necessity the administration of its offices and ordinances belongs to them.

There are occasional directions for the guidance of the people in some acts of peculiar significance; they are told to "kneel" here or to "stand" there, or sometimes what to "say with" or "say after" the minister in portions of the service which are of special importance.

But in the main, and for the reasons given, the appointments concerning the ritual of the Prayer Book were made chiefly for the clergy, and hence the obligation and responsibility for a right ministration of that ritual rests almost wholly on them.

"Some are scandalized at the sight of this immense amount of freedom, and assume that there must be some limits to it which are not expressed in American legislation."

There are very many who assume for themselves the entire freedom here claimed, but deny it to those who would apply the same principle to views antagonistic to their own, but the author of the above cited article is as logical as he is frank. Either we have a law which requires conscientious and literal obedience in all its parts from all, or we are without any law, and every one is equally at liberty to manipulate the services of the Church as he desires. It is well to have the matter so stated that every one may see just what it does imply, and also the admission that such a claim is wholly new in the history of the Church, hence cannot be regarded as an element of her Catholic and ancient polity.

In proof of the essential fact that "this Church" has a ritual law, and that that law is her Prayer Book, there need be no further evidence than the considerations already presented (in Lecture I) in treating of the word "use" on its title-page.

In the light of history and the established significance of that term in this connection, its presence there shows of itself that whatever services or offices are contained in that book are the law of "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States" and must be performed, both as to language and ceremonial, in the mode which is there given, and no other or otherwise.

But so important a matter was not left to stand upon any single declaration, however conclusive that might be. The American Church has been careful to declare in several different forms and the most explicit manner that the Prayer Book is to be regarded as her law of doctrine and worship, and must be so accepted and obeyed by all who receive ordination at her hands, or are admitted to minister at her altars.

When the churches in the several States came together after the Revolutionary War to unite in a national organization, the General Convention, through which they acted, formed a Constitution which established the general principles on which they were willing to enter into this Union as the organic law of the whole body.

One of the Articles (Article 8) of this Constitution provided that "A Book of Common Prayer, administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, articles of religion, etc., when

“established by this or a future General Convention, “shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church “in those States which shall have adopted this Constitution.”

Immediately after the consummation of the Union and the adoption of this Constitution the General Convention thus authorized proceeded to frame a “Book of Common Prayer,” etc., and on its completion they gave it a title-page in accordance with the terms of the article and “set it forth” with a solemn RATIFICATION, which is incorporated into the book as an essential part of it, and which declares what they had done, and how they intended that their work should be regarded by the Church.

In this important document it is announced that “this Convention having in their present session (from “October 3d to October 18th, 1789) set forth a Book “of Common Prayer, etc., etc., do hereby establish said “book, and they declare it to be THE LITURGY of this “Church, and require that it be received as such by all “the members of the same.”

This ratification of the Prayer Book thus sets it forth by the very authority that gave us our national organization as a Church and “establishes it as THE LITURGY of that Church;” and the Constitution, as our organic law, requires that such a book when so “established” shall be “used” in every portion of that Church.

The language of both Constitution and Ratification is clear and unequivocal, and their intention to make this book the law of worship for the Protestant Episco-

pal Church in the United States is equally evident.¹ The Article in the Constitution (8) under which the Prayer Book was "established" as "the use" in this Church contained at first no provision as to the mode by which amendments or alterations might be made in the book. But when all the offices and formulæ that were thought advisable had been prepared, a second clause was added (in 1811) which ordained, "*That no alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or in any of the offices of the Church (or the Articles of Religion, 1829), unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof be made known to every diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention.*"

So that the Constitution of the Church in the United States not only establishes the Prayer Book and all its offices and articles as the law of doctrine and of worship for that Church, but also provides that there shall be no "alteration or addition" in either the substance or appointed modes of performing "any of its offices," whether by the Church as a whole, or by individual ministers in their parishes, without the twice repeated sanction of the National Council of the Church, and after the change proposed had been made known to every diocese within its jurisdiction.

¹ Much of the substance of Lectures IV. and V, and portions of them in nearly or quite the same language, have previously appeared in two Articles by the lecturer in the *American Church Review*—one on "Ritual Law," in March, 1880, and the other on "The Clerical Subscription of Conformity," in June, 1883. In these, however, the questions involved were discussed from a somewhat different point of view, hence the present Lectures are in reality separate presentations of the same general subjects.

It has been maintained by some that the expression "ALTERATION OR ADDITION" here applies only to changes in the forms as these are presented in the Prayer Book, hence cannot restrain the officiating priest from any modification he may choose to introduce into a service as he performs it in his own parish. But the language of the Article admits of no such construction; nor is there any ground in either reason or any portion of the book referred to for the assumption which this view implies, viz.: "that this provision of the Constitution forbids the whole Church in council to alter or add to any service until three years' delay, and yet allows each individual minister to add to or alter every service at his pleasure."

Upon the contrary, the prohibition was designed to guard alike and equally against suppression or intrusion, from whatever quarter, of either words or ceremonies in any of the formulæ or offices which "this Church" has established to "be received by all her members." They can be altered lawfully in but one way, and that is the one provided in the Constitution. To make any change in any other mode, it matters not whether in the printed volume or in the actual performance, nor whether made by presbyter or bishop, is equally to violate the fundamental Constitution of the Church, and to introduce confusion and disorder where she desires uniformity and stableness.

The provisions of the Constitution and the Prayer Book that have been given above are abundantly sufficient to show that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has a ritual law, and that this law is embodied in the Book of Common Prayer with its accompanying offices and articles.

But while this general legislation is sufficient for the guidance of the body of its members, its laity, the Church imposes upon its ministers yet more definite and solemn obligations as to their duties in the performance of its services and the teaching of her doctrines; and so little does this Church desire or intend "entire liberty of ritual" for her clergy that she requires a personal and repeated promise of compliance with her forms of worship, and her mode of ministering the Sacraments, from every man who comes to receive ordination at her hands.

At the two most impressive periods of his ministerial life, immediately before he is made a deacon, and as a condition of his ordination to the priesthood, she demands of him a "solemn engagement," in the one case "to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," and in the other, "always so to minister the Sacraments of Christ as THIS CHURCH hath received the same."

She has prepared as her form of admission to the several grades of the holy ministry a grand and profoundly significant Ordinal, every line of which is instinct with meaning and obligation, and every question in which calls for a careful weighing of all that it involves and all that it imposes.

This Ordinal is not a vague permission to minister in some branch of the Church unnamed and unknown, or in the Church at large, wholly unlimited and unpledged as to what we will minister, or how. It confers a definite commission to do and teach certain appointed and specific things, and to exercise certain other equally specific and limited prerogatives, and

while we remain in her ministry these, and these only, are our powers and privileges.

Accordingly the title of the Ordinal declares in full to what branch of the Church the vows and obligations of all its offices refer, and what is the authority under which those who are to be ordained bind themselves to act. This title is "The form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating bishops, priests and deacons, according to the order of the PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES," etc.

And when a candidate presents himself to any of our bishops to be admitted even to the office of a deacon, before his ordination he is required by the Constitution to sign a promise (Article 7) and declaration which are therein given, as follows: "*I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation. And I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.*"

And the Article goes on to demand this same promise from those who come to us from any other branch of the Church, it matters not how highly we may esteem its character or its offices, and says: "*No person ordained by a foreign bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a minister of this Church until he shall have * * * also subscribed to the aforesaid declaration.*"

Nor is this preliminary "solemn engagement" the only vow by which we bind ourselves to strict observance of the "ritual law" of our own Liturgy. When the deacon stands before his bishop for ordination to the higher order of the priesthood, among the ques-

tions he must answer is: "*Will you give your faithful diligence ALWAYS so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, as the Lord hath commanded, and as THIS CHURCH HATH RECEIVED THE SAME, according to the Commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your Cure and Charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same.*" And the answer we were called to make is, "*I will so do, by the help of the Lord.*"

Besides, then, the general obligation lying upon "all the members of this Church" to observe its appointed forms and hold to the doctrines in its standards, the clergy have thus bound themselves each, by a twice repeated promise, "to conform to" and always "to minister the same" as these have been ordained by its established "use."

And to interpret the expression "as this Church hath received," etc., to mean that the clergy can go outside the text or Rubric of its offices and introduce into these services whatever seems to them desirable or "Catholic" from some other age or portion of the Church, or can omit whatever may be thought "un-evangelical" in either word or inference, is simply to palter with language, and impose meanings on terms which all history, as well as the connections in which they stand, show they were not intended to bear. In our preliminary "engagement" the Church, whose "doctrines and worship" we were to minister, is distinctly named; and the Constitution, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordinal all declare that "this Church," whose standards and offices are to be our law of service, is "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States."

There always has been, and still remains inherent in the office of the bishop, an authority, recognized and reaffirmed in our Canons (Title 1, Canon 15, § 14), to provide services on special occasions for his own diocese, and he has also from the same primitive source, as has been already shown, authority over ritual in matters not otherwise provided for, and also the power of "godly admonition," which we all promise at our ordination to follow "with a glad mind and will," which is also the basis of a portion of our canonical legislation (Title 1, Canon 22, § 2). But even a bishop has no right in this branch of the Church to alter, add too, omit or vary from any of the offices which are contained in the Prayer Book, nor in any part of them, whether the language of the text or the mode of performance ordered in the Rubrics; for these being "set forth" by the united act of the "bishops, clergy and laity," are a law equally binding on all, and one that requires from all alike submission and obedience.

Hence it is absurd for the individual minister to claim that he has any power allowed him under the law of *this Church* to mutilate or interpolate in either words or acts the services which it is the chief purpose of that very law to keep unchanged and uniform.

While the assumption that there is an inherent right in the parish minister to exercise at his own will or whim this high prerogative is so wholly unwarranted or uncatholic that I am quite sure all ages of the Church, and all its portions, may be safely challenged to produce a single instance in which such authority

was vested in the priest or parish, or where, if in a few rare cases, some may have presumed to act as if they had such powers, the assumption has not been instantly and sternly repudiated as utterly alien to the whole spirit and legislation of the Church.

In view, therefore, of the universal principles of ritual law in all times of the Church, and especially of the personal obligations and promises by which the clergy of "this Church" have bound themselves to the observance of its formulæ, the language of Archdeacon Sharp on this subject to the clergy of England may be fittingly cited here: ¹ P. 5—"As regards the *Rubric, we have, by our subscription at ordination, and one of our vows at the altar for the order of priesthood, tied ourselves down to a regular, constant, conscientious performance of all and everything prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer.*" P. 6—"Subject to this proviso, that the thing be practicable, which, perhaps, cannot be said of all Rubrics in all Churches." P. 7—"And whosoever among the clergy either adds to it or diminishes from it, or useth any other rule instead of it, as he is in the eye of the law so far a Nonconformist, so it behooves him to consider with himself whether in point of conscience he be not a breaker of his word and trust, and an eluder of his engagements with the Church."

But many who would not willingly violate the intended sense and obligation of either their ordination vows or their solemn engagement of conformity, yet hold the opinion that our clergy are at liberty, from

¹ "The Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer," etc., by Thomas Sharp, D.D., Archdeacon of Northumberland.

our original connection with the English Church and the general accordance of our offices with her forms, to introduce into our services any of the usages of *that Church* that may seem desirable, even though not contained in our Rubrics. And the claim is made that this is justified by the expression in the Preface of the American Prayer Book, "that this Church is far from "intending to depart from the Church of England in "any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship."

But quite the contrary is the truth. The main purpose of the Preface to the American Book is to assert the right of each organized branch of the Catholic Church to prepare for itself "such DIFFERENT forms and usages as may seem most meet for the edification of the people," "provided the substance of the faith be kept entire," and in connection with this to declare the reasons which impelled the Church in the United States to exercise this right, and to set forth as her Liturgy "the particular forms of Divine worship, and the rights and ceremonies appointed to be used therein," which were contained in her Book of Common Prayer.

In accordance with this purpose, the Preface states that this Church had become "ecclesiastically independent" in consequence of the Revolution, and that it had thus become free "to model and organize" its Liturgy, which had previously been that of "the Church of England," "in such manner as it might judge most convenient for its future prosperity."

The first matter calling for action in these new conditions was "those alterations in the Liturgy which had

become necessary in the prayers for our civil rulers." But the Preface goes on to say, "while these alterations "were in review before the Convention they could not "but, *with gratitude to God*, embrace the *happy occasion* "which was offered to them to establish such *other alterations* and *amendments* as might be deemed expedient."

In making these changes we are told, indeed, that "this Church is far from intending to depart from the "Church of England in any *essential point* of doctrine, "discipline or worship, or further than local circumstances require." But from this very assertion it is evident, as the whole Preface implies, that they deemed "the alterations and amendments" made to be such as the "local circumstances" did require; and further, so just and "weighty" did they feel "the considerations moving" them thereto, that they could not refrain from expressing their "gratitude to God" that the occasion and conditions had been "offered to them" to make these changes and thus to promulgate "the truths of the Gospel" in what they deemed "the clearest, plainest, most affecting and majestic manner."

Hence, so far from allowing us to restore the forms of the English Prayer Book where these differ from ours, the import of the whole Preface, especially when taken in connection with the promise of conformity and the ordination vow, is a strong affirmation of the duty of the clergy of the American Church "always to minister the doctrine and sacraments" in precisely the special forms in which these have been embodied in our offices, and requires that we should accept the services of our book, both in their Rubric and text, as

explicitly intended to be "the use" and law of the American Church in place of "The Book of Common Prayer," however revered, admired and loved, "according to the use of the Church of England."

Thus the whole legislation of our Church in the United States, whether in the Constitution of its national organization or in its Prayer Book, shows that it was designed to establish the "rites and ceremonies" of its own "Liturgy," as the law and the only law of worship for its clergy and people in their respective conditions and spheres.

The English Church and its principles were held in the highest regard and honor by those who framed our Prayer Book; where its offices or their history could shed any light on the interpretation or application of corresponding parts of our services they were consulted as of preponderating weight, and in those *classes of things where there is no legislation* by either the Church or the civil authority in this country, such as the rights of a rector in his church, the nature of pew-holding, the privileges of pew-holders and matters of like character, the similar relations in the English Church have furnished the principles by which the courts have been guided in their decisions on our affairs. And hence, in so far and in such conditions, the laws of the English Church may be regarded as the basis of the law governing our Church in the United States (see the decision of Chief Justice Beasley, of New Jersey, in *Lynd vs. Menzies*).

But there is no place for any such reference to the law or the customs of England in subjects on which our Church has itself taken action; hence not on any

of the offices which are "set forth" in our Prayer Book or any of the forms or language in which they are to be administered; for all these have been "established" by the legislation of this Church as it desires and "requires" they "shall be received by ALL its members," and they have been accepted and applied by every bishop in his diocese as its authoritative "use," so that no individual minister has a right to re-introduce the words or usages of the English Book into his services any more than to establish an independent Church according to his own ideas.

But there is another phase of our relation to the historic past that is held by many, and this is, that the living continuity of the Church through all the ages gives to every clergyman of both the Church of England and, from it, of the United States, the authority to introduce again into his performance of its offices whatever of the discontinued "rights and ceremonies" of any of the English "uses" before the Reformation he may desire, especially of the "use of Sarum."

In accordance with this theory, it is maintained "that some of the prescribed ritual of the Sarum use "was omitted at the Reformation, but whatever was "not specifically and by name rejected remained a "part of the Church's lawful inheritance."

In the first place, the "Sarum use," on which so much stress is laid, was never at any time THE legal ritual of "the Church of England" as a whole. It was originally nothing more than the "use" of the single diocese of Sarum (Salisbury); little by little it was adopted by a considerable number of the

bishops of the South of England as the order for their respective dioceses, and as such it was the law of worship for the clergy in those dioceses, but not for any others or any otherwhere. Each bishop adopted "the use" he preferred and gave it to the clergy within his own jurisdiction as the law they must obey.

It has, indeed, been frequently asserted that in the year 1541, a short time before the Reformation, a resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury directed that *the Sarum use* should be employed in all the dioceses in that province. But Dixon, the latest authority on this period, has shown, as we have previously noted (*ante*, p. 31), that this decree referred only to the private devotions of the clergy, and accordingly did not impose this ritual on their public ministrations.

But however extensive may have been the employment of the "Sarum use" in the Province of Canterbury, it never was adopted in the Northern Convocation, that of York, and it certainly was not the universal or accepted "use" of the whole Church of England at the time of the formation of the First Book of Edward VI (1549), for the preface of that book gives as one reason for its establishment, "where heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, some the use of Bangor, some of York and some of Lincoln. Now, from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use," so that the *Sarum ritual* never was the legal ritual of the Church of England, but only a diocesan order, more or less widely used in one Province of that Church, and a priest of Bangor or of York would

have had no more liberty to interpolate a portion of its offices into the appointed services of his own diocese than fragments of the ceremonial of St. Basil or St. James.

But not only was the "Sarum use" never the lawful ritual of a priest in any diocese whose bishops had not appointed it as his order, the whole history of the Church of England at the Reformation and since shows that the intention of the English Church in establishing its "use" was, that all the previously existing "uses" should terminate and be put away so far as any connection with the public service was concerned, and that the language and ceremonies given in its present authorized book were the only words and symbolical ceremonies which its clergy were to be allowed to employ in the performance of any of the offices it had "set forth" for them to minister.

This position is stated, and in terms which admit no reasonable doubt, in the Preface of the Book of 1549, already quoted. In its earlier portions it had referred to the character of the previous offices, especially their numerous and complicated rules, and then goes on to say, "here is set forth an order whereby the same shall be redressed," "yet because there is no remedy, but that of necessity there must be some rules—certain rules are here set forth which, as they be few in number, are plain and easy to be understood," and "furthermore by this order the curates shall need NONE OTHER BOOK for their public service *but* THIS ONE BOOK and the Bible." The practical outcome of all which is, the declaration which we have previously cited, that "now from henceforth all the whole realm

“shall have but one use, and,” it continues, “if any
“would judge this way more painful because ALL
“THINGS MUST be read upon the book—if those men
“will weigh their labor with the profit in knowledge
“which they will obtain—they will not refuse the
“pain.”

This Preface could not have been written, nor the language it employs made a portion of the Prayer Book, of which it still remains a part, had the intention of its framers been to permit the clergy to eke out its rules by those of the discarded uses, or to allow the re-introduction of their discontinued forms into its ceremonial.

The principle which was thus established, with its reasons, in the Preface of the Book of 1549 was repeated in the statute by which it was made the law of the whole kingdom. This declares that the purpose in preparing the book referred to had been “to make ONE
“convenient and meet order, rite and fashion of open
“prayer, and administration of the Sacraments,” and that this had been done after mature consideration of the things “which be altered and those things which
“be retained in the said book, also, looking especially
“to the honor of God and great quietness which, by
“the grace of God, shall ensue upon the one and uni-
“form rite and order in such common prayer, and rites
“and external ceremonies to be used throughout Eng-
“land,” and it then proceeds to enact that “all and
“singular ministers shall be bounden to say and use
“the matins, evensong, celebration of the Lord’s Sup-
“per, etc., etc., in such order and form as is mentioned
“in said book and none other, or otherwise.”

And that there might be no return to the former "uses" or a covert restoration of any of the forms or ceremonies not "retained" in the revised book, this same Parliament, at its next session, orders¹ "that since the Book of Common Prayer had been set forth, containing nothing but the pure Word of God, corrupt, vain and superstitious services should be disused; and THEREFORE, all antiphonars, missals, grayles, processionals, manuals, legends, pies, portuasses, primers in Latin or English, couchers, journals, ordinals, or other books or writings heretofore used for the service of the Church (other than such as are or shall be set forth by the King's majesty) shall be clearly and utterly abolished and forbidden to be used in this realm."

Unless language be wholly eviscerated of all meaning the manifest intention of this Act, especially when taken in connection with the declaration of the Prayer Book that "there should be but one use," was not only to forbid but to prevent all return to the distinctive features of any of the previous rituals, and that both as to their words and usages they were to be "clearly and utterly abolished" from the public worship of the Church of England.

So evidently, indeed, was this its purpose, that directly on the passage of the statute an order² was issued by the King, and "afterward confirmed and extended by an Act of Parliament," to the Archbishop of Canterbury, stating that although "the Book of

¹ In 1549, quoted "Phillimor's Ecclesiastical Judgments," p. 370.

² "Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England," by Edward Cardwell, D.D. 2 vols. Vol. I, p. 74.

“Common Prayer had been set forth and commanded to be used by all personnes wythyn this our realm, yet it had been noysed abroad that they should have again their olde Lattenne service, their conjured bredde and water, with such lyke vayne and superstitious ceremonies,” therefore he should command the dean, parson, vicar, etc., of every cathedral and parish, to bring to some appointed place all antiphonnars, missales, etc., etc., “after the use of Sarum, Yorke or ANY OTHER PRIVATE use, and all other bokes of service, the KEPING WHEREOF SHOLD BE A LET to the said Boke of Commenne Prayers, and that you them so deface and abolshe that they never after may serve eyther to any soche use as they were provided for, or be AT ANY TIME a lett to that uniforme order which is now set forthe.”

The effect of this enactment was, as Collier, Wood, Maskell, and others who write of this period tell us, an almost total destruction of the books and manuscripts containing the former services, all over England; and whatever may be thought of the fanaticism or brutality of such acts, one thing is sure, they demonstrate that it was not intended by those who revised and set forth the Reformed English Prayer Book that the use of Sarum, or any other pre-Reformation use, should be restored in whole or in part in the performance of the public service of the Church of England, or that any of the symbolical ceremonies, which had not been mentioned and directed by the existing Rubrics of the English Book should be brought back and used again additional to those which were appointed in that book. And hence the assertion of a right to re-introduce the

rites and forms which had been thus abandoned and abolished, under the plea that such action is in accord with either the work or the intention of the Church of England in the framing of her present Prayer Book, is simply to falsify history, and to make her seem to maintain the very things she was most careful to repudiate and put away.

The principle which was announced so emphatically and so stringently enforced at the first establishment of the English Book of Common Prayer has been reasserted in connection with each of its subsequent revisions; the original Preface of 1549, of which it forms the essence, has been continued in them all, while the several acts of uniformity by which these successive editions have been established have in different terms, but always the same in substance, continued it as law, and in the language of the statute of 1558, equally forbidden "any manner of parson to refuse to use the said "common prayers AS they be set forth in said book, or to "use ANY OTHER rite, ceremony, order or manner of "celebrating the Lord's Supper than is MENTIONED AND "SET FORTH in said book."

The terms in which this double obligation is expressed in the Canons of 1603 (Canon 14) are also essentially the same. They say, "All ministers shall observe "the orders, rites and ceremonies prescribed in the "Book of Common Prayer, without either DIMINISHING "in any respect, or ADDING ANYTHING in the matter or "form thereof."

These Canons are especially worthy of note, as no objection can lie against them on the ground that they were the Act of Parliament, as is often said of the stat-

utes of uniformity. The Convocation of 1603 met under the royal warrant of James I, and enacted a body of 141 Canons. These were approved and ratified by the King, but for some reason were never passed upon by Parliament; hence they are the expression of the Church and the Church alone. So that in them the Church, by her sole and unquestionable action, repeats the old and correct principle and makes it the law which she intends shall bind the clergy.

The obligation that the clergy of the Church should minister the service which she gave them, and as she gave it to them, is shown by all these acts to be a fundamental principle of the Church of England, as it had really been of the primitive Church, and of every portion of the Catholic Church through all the ages, and as such it was again embodied in the Act, which set forth the last revision which the English Church has felt it needful to make of her orders and offices.

This was in 1661 and 1662, after the fall of the Puritan commonwealth and influence, and the restoration of the Church and the monarchy. Complaints had been made, and excuses for their neglect to use the existing forms, urged by the Puritans on the ground that the later recensions of the Prayer Book, those of Queen Elizabeth (1558) and King James I (1604) had been "established" without regular and adequate authority, not having been prepared by or submitted to the official action of the Convocations; and it was determined that the present revision should not be open to objection or question on this score. Accordingly the two Convocations, summoned by the commission of the

King (Charles II), came together¹—Canterbury in regular session, and York represented by proxies—authorized to “review” the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal, “comparing the same with the most “ancient liturgies which have been used in the Church “in the primitive and purest times,” and to “make “such alterations and additions in said books as to “them seemed meet and convenient” (“Cardwell’s Conferences,” p. 300).

The Convocations, after completing their revision, sent the book, in the form it has ever since retained, to Parliament, with the approval of the King. The Parliament then passed a statute making the book thus prepared the law of the realm; and by this concurrent action of the Church and the State the services and ritual which this book contains are now “set forth” as those which only may be used in any public worship of the Church. The statute says (§ 17), “No form or order of common prayer, administration of “Sacraments, etc., shall be openly used in any church, “etc., other than what is prescribed and appointed to be “used in and by the said book;” and as one of its reasons for requiring this “universal agreement in the “public worship of God,” it had previously declared “that it was “to the intent (§ 2) that every person “within this realm may *certainly know the rule* to which “he is to conform in public worship.”

Thus, whether we take the language of the various Acts of the Church or Parliament in reference to the

¹ Lathbury’s “History of the Convocation,” p. 286.

Parker’s “Introduction to the Revisions of the Prayer Book, p. 430.”

Joyce’s “Acts of the Church,” p. 219.

appointed services of the Prayer Book, or the application of these Acts by the bishops and clergy of the Church from the time of the Reformation down, we shall find that the law of worship of the English clergy does not allow them to introduce into their services the ritual of the "Sarum use," or any other "use" of the ante-Reformation periods, nor any of the disused ceremonies connected with these rituals.

Dr. Lee, in "The Directorium Anglicanum," has indeed constructed a sort of mongrel service, composed of bits and patches from any of the offices, ancient or modern, that chanced to please his fancy; and he claims as his warrant for this incongruous production that¹ "what was not specifically, legally and actually abolished in the sixteenth century is still in force," the "Ritual of the Altar"² prepared by Mr. Orby Shipley while he was yet in the communion of the Church of England, as his conception of the proper mode in which the English clergy should perform the communion service, is also based on the same principle, and sundry lesser lights have followed their example and framed like fantastic services for their own use, which they too think to justify by a like assumption.

But whatever weight, if any, may be due to this assertion, it cannot avail as a ground on which the clergy may bring back again the ritual of any of the pre-

¹"The Directorium Anglicanum," by the Rev. George Frederick Lee, D.C.L., F.S.A., Vicar of All Saints, Lambeth, 4th edition, p. 44.

²"Ritual of the Altar," by Rev. Orby Shipley.

To be sure Mr. Shipley has given a very emphatic illustration of the real significance of the principles of this school by connecting himself since the publication of his work with the Church of Rome.

Reformation diocesan "uses" into the performance of the present offices, for the preceding evidence has shown: 1. That the distinct purpose of Church and Parliament alike was that there "should be BUT ONE USE throughout the whole realm," and this must be the forms and ceremonies "mentioned and set forth" in the Book of Common Prayer. 2. In order the more effectually to enforce this law, and because certain persons *would still resort to some of these old usages*, it was ordered both by statute and royal injunction, that ALL the BOOKS and WRITINGS which contained any of the former services and ritual whatsoever were to be "utterly and clearly abolished, extinguished and forbidden ever to be used or kept in this realm." 3. And this ordinance was so universally and strictly carried out by the BISHOPS AND OTHER OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH, that it has been a matter of great difficulty ever since to find even a few perfect copies of them in all England for reference and consultation by students who were interested in that branch of learning (Maskell). 4. Along with this, and as the legal and intended substitute in place of what was thus done away, the Prayer Book as it was from time to time set forth was given to the Church with the always repeated command that the services therein appointed were to be used as therein "mentioned," and described, and that nothing "should be either added to or diminished" from any of them. 5. That accordingly, ALL the pre-Reformation services as contained in their several uses, except those contained in the Prayer Book and in the manner therein appointed, were "specifically, legally and actually abolished in the sixteenth century," hence are not "in

force," do not "remain as a part of the Church's lawful inheritance."

If the right thus to restore the "abolished" forms of the mediæval English "use," in whole or in part, does not belong to the clergy of the Church of England, and has not at any time been theirs through all the centuries since the first revision of the services in the reign of Edward VI (1549), we cannot have derived it from them. Hence we have no authority in the historical facts of the case, and certainly none from the acts of our own National Church, to assume that such a power inheres in our clergy of to-day.

It is well that we revive and study these memorable voices from the past, that we read the words and know the manner in "which our fathers have declared the noble work thou, O Lord, didst in their days and in the old time before them." It is well to imbibe into our hearts and lives all they have of fervor, of devotion, of lofty aspiration, of high spiritual truth, and they have much of all these remaining in them, even after the large portions of their best thoughts which we have preserved in our offices and interwoven through every fibre of our spiritual life.

It is better still to go farther back, nearer the Divine source and author of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," to drink deep of those earlier forms, the liturgies of the Apostolic ages, the departure from which was the beginning of the sore evils which in the after centuries made the Reformation a vital necessity, if the true Gospel was to be kept alive among men, and the spirit, the thought which pervaded those primal offices of its Divine service was to be preserved as a living power in the world.

They were the rich outpourings of the devotional life of the Church while the very words of the Apostles were yet fresh in its heart; utterings of both the worship and the truth of the Church, while these were still aglow with the Spirit of the Pentecost. And it is one of the chief glories of the Church of England, in which we also as one of her branches have a share, that she finds in these early days, and these grand monuments of Apostolic truth, the standard to which, in dependence on the light of Holy Scripture, she has endeavored to conform all her services and all her authoritative teaching, and the test by which she seeks, and wishes all her children to "try all things and hold fast that which is good."

But whatever of love or admiration we may have for these ancient forms, whether in themselves or as remains of a past which had in it so much that was good and great; and however much we may, if we are earnest ought to bring their truths before the minds of our people, and endeavor to make their thoughts familiar with all that is true and wise in them, the only question with which, in the actual service of the priest at the altar, we practically have to do is, "What is the *Law* to which we, as members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, have promised obedience, and what are the ordinances of 'doctrine and Sacraments' which we have vowed 'always to minister?'"

It is not consistent with the purpose of these lectures to go into the details of special Rubrics, nor to discuss the minute questions of ritual law which may be raised concerning them; hence we must leave all

these, however interesting and important they may be, to the specific authors on ritual and ecclesiastical law. All that can be even alluded to here are the general principles of the interpretation and practical application of the services as they are "set forth" in our Prayer Book.

These may be condensed into the following propositions:

1. Each office in the Book of Common Prayer is a connected and obligatory whole, and as such is to be performed as "is mentioned in the book" with no addition of any words or¹ ceremonies not therein directed, and no omission from those which are therein given.

2. While no "rite or ceremony" can lawfully be added to those appointed for each service in the Prayer Book, yet the direction to perform any service in a certain mode carries with it the permission to supply such "ornaments" and do² such acts as are implied in and subsidiary to this performance, and which have been

¹ Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Judgments," p. 93, speaking of the Communion office, says: "In the present Prayer Book the manual Acts are advisedly specified with great distinctness and particularity. The compilers had before them the 1st Book of Edward VI and carefully considered the Rubrics it contained, and in my opinion the legal consequence of the omission of this ceremony (adding water to the wine in the Communion office) must be considered as a prohibition, as a ceremony designedly omitted in and therefore prohibited by the Rubrics of the present Prayer Book."

² Such are the credence table, the various modes in which the Psalter may be said or sung, an organ for the music, etc., all which are incidental and subsidiary to the performance of the service as this is directed.

so recognized in the continued¹ usage of this Church under its present formularies.

3. An opinion is widely prevalent that the obligation of the Rubrics extends only to things positively ordered, or things positively forbidden, and that in regard to things neither commanded nor prohibited in terms, the minister is at liberty to introduce as many or whatever of them into his service as he may desire.

This is in fact only another form of the claim for priestly freedom in ritual which has been already discussed, but when presented in this mode it is specious and has misled very many. Such a construction of the Rubrics could never have originated with anyone who had even a rudimentary knowledge of the history of ritual and the Catholic principles of ritual law, nor can it now be seriously maintained by any who are guided in their judgment on Church questions by the uniform and universal action of the Church of the past.

Justice Phillimore indeed mentions this class of "things neither forbidden nor ordered," and decides that such of them as are implied in the performance

¹ "Continued usage" in such matters is recognized as the common law of the Church (Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Judgments," p. 73), and hence may be regarded as sufficient warrant for the performance of certain incidental or unordered customs, but this requires, as a necessary condition of its authority, that the usage shall have been continuous *from the time* of the establishment of the present formularies and the law written in them.

But it cannot be invoked to permit the re-introduction of usages which were put aside when the existing forms were established, and hence have been for centuries discontinued in our branch of the Church. Phillimore, in asserting the force of such law, also shows what are its limitations, and that it can be applied only as stated above.

of what has been ordained, or to use his own expression, "such as are incidental or subsidiary" to the services as these are directed in the Rubrics should be allowed, or rather, they are implicitly permitted by the principles of rubrical interpretation already given.¹ But in regard to all others of this class he pronounces them to be utterly and absolutely illegal, unless, indeed, they belong to that category of things about which there are "doubts or diversities of opinion" whether they are allowable or not, and he says of these, "the doing or use of them must be governed by the living discretion of some person in authority" (p. 69), and the person in whose hands this "living discretion" is vested is not the individual priest or half-year old deacon; there is no shadow of any such "ritual liberty" permitted by the learned Judge of the Arches; he is far too sound a canonist and too Catholic a Churchman to admit such a puritan and unchurchly principle into any judgment of his. He places the authority on all this matter where it has "always and everywhere" belonged, in the keeping of the

¹ "Ornaments" in the ritual sense differ from "decorations" (Phillimore, etc., pp. 96, 192). An ornament is an article actively "used" in the performance of a service, as vestments, books, chalice, patens, etc.; being used in the service they may have a meaning, hence they are constant subjects of ritual legislation and come frequently under the view of Canon and rubrical law, in which they are dealt with as ceremonials.

A "decoration" is part of the structure of the building, or an article present in the church, but "inert or unused," that is, not employed in the performing of the service, such as pictures, flowers, a cross on the holy table, etc. These not entering into the actual service have very rarely and only under peculiar circumstances been made the subjects of canon or rubrical law, and are generally left to the taste of the individual minister or the monitory regulation of the bishop.

bishop of the diocese, and finds it in him as "the officer in whose hands, previous to "the statutory enactment of "ANY prayer book, the Church had placed a supreme "command over all that relates to her ritual" (p. 70).

Where, then, there is a definite text and Rubric these and these only are the service we are to minister; to take from them is to mutilate what the Church has bidden her servants to teach and means her people to hear; to add to them is to make the Church seem to express and hold what in her wisdom she has refused to present as her doctrine.

This obligation of honest, exact conformity to law is binding equally on all within the Church's borders, presbyter, bishop and laity alike. But where the law is silent, or as the English Prayer Book says, "for the "resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how "to understand, do and execute the things contained "in the book," there, we of the clergy at least, are all bound—as well by our ordination promise as by "the principle upon which the order and discipline of the Church was in obedience to the will of Christ been founded by His Apostles" (Phillimore, p. 70)—"to follow with a glad mind and will the godly admonitions "of our bishops, and to submit ourselves to their godly "judgments."

The principles of ritual law as given above, although only in the barest outline, are quite sufficient for the guidance of those who are desirous to know the true nature of the "conformity" to which they have bound themselves at their ordination, and what is their proper authority and duty in ministering the services which this Church has given them to perform.

And from these principles it will be seen that we are not entrusted with a roving commission to go through the rituals—real or imaginary—of all ages and countries and compound a medley of scraps and fancy work, and present this to our people in place of the worship which the Prayer Book has appointed for us to offer.

Neither have we a charter of unlimited license authorizing us to incorporate our own personal or partisan theories, whether of one school or another, into the offices of “this Church,” and thus to make it appear that they have her authority by giving them the weight and name of being her expression or her acts when they are neither.

This Church has established her doctrines and worship in the words and forms in which she desired to have them always ministered. No one is constrained to remain in her service an hour longer than his convictions harmonize with her requirements, but while he does continue in her membership one thing is certain, that he is bound not only by forceful law but also by his own most solemn engagement and vow “to conform to the doctrine and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church,” and to none other.

LECTURE V.

THE LITURGY IN ITS RELATIONS TO "THE TEACHING CHURCH"—THE IMPORTANCE OF A UNIFORM LITURGY AS A CHIEF MEANS OF THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH.

IN the preceding Lecture we have shown the legal obligations which bind the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and, so far as they are concerned, its laity also, to conform with strict and conscientious obedience to its Constitution and Prayer Book, that these, and these only, are our law of ritual and doctrine.

We have also shown that every minister in "this Church" has voluntarily assumed these obligations by a "solemn engagement" before his ordination, and has renewed them as an essential part of his ordination vow; that he has received no authority from any source to minister the offices established in the Prayer Book, in any other way or manner than they are appointed by the words and Rubrics of "the Liturgy," which "this Church requires to be received by all its members," and that such obedience of the clergy to the law of ritual of their own branch of the Church has always been a fundamental principle of the Church Catholic; hence, that the assumption by any priest of the power to do otherwise is unwarranted by all the history of

the past, and by the sacred promises with which he has bound himself in that portion of the Church which he now serves.

But the Prayer Book, while it thus contains and is the law of worship of the American Church, is much more than this; and the obligations and responsibilities connected with the use of its offices and ordinances involve issues that underlie and give additional weight and importance to the law.

The Church is a Divine organism, has a Divine commission, works with Divinely ordered agencies, and toward ends which are marked out for her by her Divine Head.

Any attempt to consider the nature and position of the Church without giving full weight to these considerations must ever fail to grasp her real place and operation in the world, or her essential difference from the multitude of other institutions or associations for doing good which now exist, or ever have existed, among men.

It is quite possible to exaggerate this side of the nature of the Church, or to extend it to conditions where it does not apply. Vast harm has been done by this one-sided presentation and unwarranted application of the Divine, or, if you will, supernatural element of the Church and its ministry.

Church history shows us that essentially the same error has been at times displayed in certain mistaken opinions concerning the person of our blessed Lord. He was regarded by these errorists as wholly Divine; that which seemed human was only so in outward qualities, in form and appearance, there was no real

humanity there; the only real being His person possessed was the Divine.

So, too, the principle of this heresy has been extended in certain systems of theology to the Holy Eucharist, and those who hold this view maintain that there is no natural substance of the bread or wine remaining after their consecration, but that their sensible properties are merely an external veil of appearance under which the sole reality is the substance and the person of the living Christ.

But notwithstanding the perversions to which this great truth is thus liable, the Church must be regarded, in any right view of her character, as a Divine and spiritual organism, while at the same time it must always be remembered that her agents are men, her instrumentalities all human, the elements on which she works human conscience, human reason, human will, and the results she aims at to have men lovingly receive her truths and willingly work with her, accordingly, that in every function and office, while her spirit and power are from God, her means all act through man.

In the practical application of these two phases of her nature to her organization and her work, the Church has, by the terms of the commission from Christ, under which she acts, two corresponding lines of operation.

These are in one aspect clearly separate, in another, never to be disunited. Each can act within its sphere and produce a certain good, but neither can attain its full results without the co-operation of the other.

For the Church is by the Divine ordainment at the same time and equally

1. The conveyer of God's spiritual gifts through Christ to the world and men,

2. And the teacher of God's truth as it is in Christ, in all that is needful for man's spiritual life in time and eternity.

Both these offices are clearly expressed in Christ's commission to His disciples, as well as by other passages of Holy Scripture, and have been exercised by the Church in all ages from the very beginning.

The first is embodied in the commands of our Lord, "Go ye, make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them," etc., and "Do this in remembrance of Me."

The second is given in the equally authoritative words, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you."

Accordingly, as the giver, the dispenser, the medium of the Divine blessings prepared for man through Christ, she has the great sacraments of Baptism, by which men are new-born into the kingdom of God, made members of the body of Christ, and the Holy Communion, which, to those who receive it rightly and with faith, is the nourishing of their souls with the spiritual realities of Christ's body broken for them, and His precious blood poured out for their life.

Besides these, she is the witness and keeper of Holy Scripture. She sanctifies with her benediction the marriage bond and makes it an ordinance of God, and not a mere civil contract to be severed by man's will or law. She stands by the grave and keeps alive through all ages the sublime fact of man's resurrection.

And with her innumerable ministrations of love and mercy, and comfort and guidance, and the influence

that goes out unceasingly from these she is always dispensing to the world, even when it most contemns and jeers at her Divineness, the life and the help and the spirit of her Head and Master.

But how does she exercise the second of her Divine missions? How, as a Church, in her organic, authoritative capacity as "the pillar and ground of the truth" does she teach men the "things which Christ commanded her" to maintain and declare to all nations?

How was this done in the beginning? By what means and agencies were the essentials of the faith preserved and handed down in the earlier centuries, before there were, as yet, written, universal creeds to which all could refer, or the great councils had spoken the belief of the Church in words which the Christian world of all time was to receive as its symbol of the faith?

How—coming down to later ages—how was the substance of Gospel truth mainly preserved in the long dark centuries, when, generation after generation, the Northern barbarians swept down over Europe in desolating waves of brutality, ignorance and heathenism?

And amid the corruptions and perversions which the Church herself had contracted in this long struggle, how were the essential verities of the faith held fast and made known (as they were) whatever marring they may have received through superstition and ignorance, or however gross may have been the errors which so often encrusted and disguised the truth?

The one great means by which, from the beginning and through all the after centuries with their ever changing conditions, this has been done, is the ministra-

tion of the fixed, appointed, authoritative forms of the public worship of the Church, especially of her Liturgy.

The Holy Scriptures were, of course, the Divine treasury in which the teachings needful for man's spiritual guidance and instruction were all contained. They were the Word of God, and by them the Gospel was set forth in all its fulness, and so declared that all who would might find and follow it.

But in the early ages, although freely allowed for use among the people, the Bible, in manuscripts only, costly and cumbrous, was by no means easy of access to the mass of the community anywhere, and it was chiefly known through the large portions of it which were read at every Liturgy, and in the instructions given to the new converts waiting baptism, and in especial meetings for devotion of the more zealous members.

In the Middle Ages books of every kind had almost wholly disappeared from ordinary life, the Bible among the rest, and a considerable portion of the clergy, in some sections of the Church, were so ignorant that they could not even read their offices, in their written form, but said them only by memory as they had been taught.

Hence, while the Bible was, and was constantly referred to by the theologian as the word of God's truth to men, the practical teaching and preservation of this truth for man through all these ages was, of necessity, chiefly done by the offices and official ministrations of the Church; and of these, as I have said, the most important were her appointed and authoritative forms of public worship, especially the Liturgy.

The Church, from her very beginning, has attached great value to the individual preaching of the living

speaker. It is among her prime means of influence and good. There is a kind of power in it, when rightly employed, which no other agency can approach, much less supplant. It is the Divine Word coming forth, winged by the Spirit, from the heart of a true man of God, and as such has always been, and was ordained to be, a vital element in the Church's great commission, and in the work which has been given her to do.

A sad day is it for the Church, or any portion of it, when it lowers the function of the preacher, or regards the sermon, the spoken word, as something of only incidental or trivial import. Especially fatal will it be to the Church of our time, should the tendency, now rife in many minds, to thrust preaching into a corner, prevail among the body of our clergy, and they grow to feel, as some already say, "that anything will do for a sermon if only the service be performed."

The world needs more than in any other period, save, perchance, in the ages when the Church was first contending with the empire of heathendom, men mighty in the Word. The world is suffering upon every hand for lack of preachers who can go forth into it with the learning, the devotion, the fire of the men who conquered the philosophy of Greece and the old lore of Egypt, and won to the Gospel the wide, practical knowledge of the world-mastering Rome; men who can now so preach the truths of God's Word and the Divine life of the Son of Man to the mind and the thought of this age, that eternity shall again become to the hearts of those who hear even more real than time, and the Spirit and teaching of Christ be felt as more wise than all the earth-bounded sciences of man.

Wherever, in all ages of the Church, there has been a special awakening of spiritual interest, wherever men have been deeply moved by Divine realities and Christian truths, there, it mattered not what was the type of theology, or what the peculiar conditions of the age or the community, there always has been an outburst of the living preached word, and the ministry has been alive with fervid preachers.

Hence, as a power of prime importance in the Church, as an agency of great moment in arousing, instructing and influencing the hearts of men, preaching should call forth the highest faculties and receive the most careful attention of the clergy to whom, as one of their high functions, this mighty instrument for good has chiefly been entrusted. But, important as the work of the preacher is in the performance of the Church's mission to the world, the words of the individual cannot take the place of definite and authoritative teaching by the Church in her organic character, or render such mode of teaching useless or unnecessary.

The minds of different men do and must see even the same subject, from widely differing points, and must attach various degrees of importance and significance to the several truths which are presented in any great system of theology or life. Phases of thought that are of chief moment to one sink comparatively into the background with another. The more intense and vigorous the minds the more their difference will come to view, the more will the special aspect of the truth they see obscure its other forms, and the more essential is it that there should be a common centre, an authoritative expression, an organic unity in which

all that is vital in the whole system should be embodied, where each of the several elements should be given its due measure, and where in words and symbolic ceremonials fixed and known to all, the truth which the body as a whole has accepted as its doctrine, should be presented and preserved.

Now, from the very days of the Apostles the liturgies have occupied just this position with regard to a large portion of the most important teachings of the Church, and they have thus been in all ages not only the central act of the Church's public service, but also its authoritative standard and teacher of the doctrines which were embodied in them.

The liturgies were, as has been already stated, originally the same in form and general contents in every portion of the Church. Nor were they ever mere¹ "conglomerates of prayers and acts," but, as Dr. Probst has pointed out, "an organic whole," a symmetrical body of the truth of the Gospel as this is related to the Holy Eucharist; so that in the centuries before the great Creeds were formulated the liturgies had been the universal embodiments of the faith taught by the Church, and thus were a chief means by which she, at the same time, instructed her people in the vital truths of the Gospel, and maintained through all her parts, and for all these ages, an organic unity of doctrine and of Christian life.

It was by means of the Liturgy then, mainly, that the faith of the Church was preserved uniform and unchanged throughout the widely scattered Christian

¹"Liturgie," etc., pp. 14, 290, 402; he traces the analogy of the primitive liturgies to the Creed, and shows that in both their order and their contents they are essentially the same.

Church in its early ages, and before any general Councils had as yet promulgated a Creed which all could possess, or had given expression and universality to the voice of the assembled Church.

The various writers and preachers of the early ages talked and wrote as now, each in his own individuality, each presenting his own peculiar phase of thought, each holding up his own special view of the truth as if that were the only form in which it was worth any regard. What can be more different in all that concerns the mode of presenting Christianity than Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine of Hippo, Justin Martyr and the Carthaginian Cyprian; but behind them all there was, not only the same Bible, with its Divine wealth of truth common to all, but also essentially the same liturgical forms, giving them all the same fundamental truths, expressed in almost the same or like meaning words and ceremonies; and good and great as they, and multitudes of others with them, were in their earnest speaking for the Church, the voice of the Church itself as an authoritative teacher, her utterances as a teaching Church (*ecclesia docens*) were not to be heard from them but from her liturgies. The men spake each for himself. The Liturgy was the Church's truth as she appointed that it should be taught to all.

Liturgies are thus, in reference to the doctrines with which they are concerned, in the language of Arch-deacon Freeman,¹ "greater than fathers." Through them the Church declares and shows what she, in her

¹ "Principles of Divine Service," Vol. II, Introduction, p. 31, he adds, "The fathers in truth ever defer to or do but expound the liturgies."

supreme authority, intends to teach,¹ and requires that her officers shall minister. For what is appointed there of word or act she holds herself responsible as God's ordained "steward of His mysteries." The words there given are what she bids her servants in her name to say, the acts there ordered are the form in which she purposes that her thought shall be conveyed.

From the importance thus belonging to the Liturgy as a chief means of the authorized teaching of the Church, as well as from its high place in the worship of the Church, it was recognized from the very first that the ordering of all matters connected with the liturgies or their performance (what is called in general the Ritual of the Church) must be allowed only to those having *especial authority* for that purpose.

The office in which this was *everywhere and always* originally vested was that of the bishop of the diocese. The continuance of the ancient forms² as he had received them was an essential part of his duty as a bishop, and if from circumstances any changes were required in either the substance or the manner of the service, it belonged to him to make them and to see that they were followed by the clergy of his jurisdiction.

At a later period regulations concerning the public service were occasionally issued by Synods or Councils

¹ Maskell's "Ancient Liturgy," etc., edition of 1844, p. 56: "The Liturgy is the great storehouse in which we are to look for and find the necessary declarations of the highest Catholic truths"—and he quotes from Muratori, "*quæ ibi dogmata occurrunt non unius privati doctoris sententiæ sunt, sed universæ illius ecclesiæ quæ iisdem Liturgiis utebatur*," p. 55.

² Probst, p. 6.

of which the bishops were always members, and these, as acts of a superior authority, controlled the ritual in all the churches of that portion of the Church for which they were ordained.

But while the liturgies might be, and often were, thus modified, sometimes for good, and sometimes, too, for evil, by bishops and by Councils, there was no such authority ever given to the individual presbyter, and no such privilege was ever recognized as belonging to his office or intentionally allowed to him in practice.

To claim, as some now do, that a right thus to direct his own ritual belongs to every minister to use as he may wish, is, as Canon Trevor has well said, ¹ "to gainsay the most notorious features of the history of Catholic liturgies, and of the English in particular. 'To the 'old godly doctors' such a 'liberty' would have appeared preposterous. Who can fancy a priest of 'the most pure and uncorrupt ages' proposing to St. Basil (for example) some alleged ante-Nicene use? or astonishing St. Chrysostom by exchanging his surplice for the last and most authentic edition of the Clementine 'splendid garment?'"

The influence of the liturgies as the authoritative teaching of the Church, and their power both to preserve the truth when they are kept pure, or to corrupt it when they have become perverted, are abundantly illustrated in the history of the Church.

Whenever anyone has endeavored to introduce a new doctrine into the Church, or to suppress one that has been previously held, he invariably made an effort to

¹ "The Catholic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," by George Trevor, A.M., D.D., p. 454.

introduce a corresponding change in either the language or the ceremonial of the Liturgy.

When Paul, of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, sought to impair the Divinity of our Lord, we find him, as the most effective means that he could use, inserting hymns containing his heresy into the Liturgy, and one of the charges most bitterly urged for his deposition was the endeavors he thus made to pervert the ancient service of the Church for the teaching of his own doctrine.

So, too, with another error which Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch, at a later period desired to establish. He added just four words embodying this falsity to the Trisagion sung in his liturgies; but slight as the change might appear, it was indignantly repelled as committing the Church to false doctrine, and in more than one city with even open battle and bloodshed.

In like manner, too, though with a different result, when an important doctrinal change in the theology of the Eucharist has anywhere succeeded in perverting the original teachings of the Liturgy, there we see that soon or late some corresponding alteration, in its prayers or ceremonial, has been effected in furtherance of, or at least in harmony with, the new dogma.

This was sometimes done by the removal or modification of portions of the old forms which conveyed an adverse opinion, or the addition of words, acts, gestures, ornaments, etc., which would express, or cause the service as it was performed to illustrate the doctrine which that portion of the Church had come to hold.

So was it that with the growth of the sacerdotal

theology in the Western Church, the early prayers for the Holy Spirit and allusions to the spiritual character of the Sacrament were almost wholly obliterated from its liturgies. And when in the twelfth century this theory reached its consummation in the dogmas of the localized adoration of Christ as a person on the altar, the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass for the dead as well as the living, and the presence of the actual person of Christ in each of the elements separately and apart from all communion, the Liturgy was made to conform to the present doctrine by ceremonials before unauthorized; and the elevation of the Sacrament, the sacring bell, rubrics for adoration of the Host, attendance without communion as mere assistants at the sacrifice, and the communion of the laity in one kind alone, became for the first time portions of the service of the Church.

And again, when the English Church at the Reformation, and we following in its steps repudiated all these errors, and determined to restore the primitive and really Catholic teachings of the Eucharist, we, too, illustrated the same principle of making the Liturgy express the doctrine that we held; and with the errors which we had abandoned, abandoned also the language and ceremonies by which they had been taught or emphasized, and allowed in our Communion Office only such prayers and acts as would teach the doctrine of the Sacrament "as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same."

A thoughtful student of the liturgies can thus trace out the course of doctrinal struggles in the Church and mark the nature of its more important doctrinal

changes by the contests around various portions of the Liturgy, and the alterations it has actually undergone, from its earliest form in the age immediately following the Apostles down to our present times, with their conflicting tendencies and endeavors.

The Liturgy having thus been from the very beginning of the Church a most effective agency in the expression and moulding of its doctrine and life, it never was permitted that the individual caprice of the individual, and virtually irresponsible minister, should alter, add to, or mutilate it as he might desire.

And it is not only a historical fact, and an universal principle of Church order, but also a necessary condition of the exercise and continuance of the function of authoritative "teaching by the Church," as contrasted with the mere personal opinions of the individual preacher, that changes in the Liturgy which involved any doctrinal significance have never been allowed to any save those who were in "places of authority." And these were primarily the bishop in his diocese, or, where it chose to act, the superior council, to which he was, himself, subordinate.

It may be said that the propagation and perpetuation of many of the worst errors of the mediæval theology was due to the influence and teaching of the Liturgy, and that around "the Mass" were gathered most of the false doctrine and uncatholic perversions of that age and system.

This is indeed the truth. The departures from Scriptural and Apostolic teaching, and the growth of their sacerdotal substitutes are marked all the way down from the sixth century to the fourteenth by correspond-

ing changes in the ritual or language of the Mass, and it was not until the completed development of the doctrine had so modified the Liturgy as to give it full expression, that the doctrine itself became supreme and irresistible in the Western Church. This very fact shows all the more forcibly the vast importance of the liturgies as the authoritative teachings of the portion of the Church which they represent, and the immeasurable evils that may flow from errors intruded into either their substance or ceremonial, or truths obliterated or obscured which properly belonged to them.

But on the other hand, the liturgies of no portion of the Church, in any country or in any age, have ever failed to keep firm hold of the great central truths of the Gospel, and to present to the people all the essential elements of the Christian life.

They have always repeated the same Catholic creeds, they have always "shown forth the Lord's death till he come," and they have always pointed men to God made manifest in Christ, and communing with Him as the source of eternal life and blessedness for the soul of man.

And further it is difficult, almost impossible, to conceive how, through all those long centuries of barbarian invasions and overturnings in Western Europe, ages of almost unceasing wars, of desolation, of ignorance, when books were scarcely to be found save in the libraries of the monasteries, or stowed away in the rubbish room of a few ancient castles, when a large portion of the inferior priesthood could hardly read the very offices they performed by rote, when only here and there one of the more accomplished bishops

felt himself able or willing to preach regularly to his people—it is difficult, I say, to conceive how through all these centuries the very existence of Christianity as a saving power among men could have been maintained, much more how its efficiency as a Church teaching and handing down the truths of the Gospel could have been preserved save by the constant, visible, everywhere repeated performance of the Liturgy, and the impression thus always kept living and real that the things which they saw imaged there were indeed truths revealed from God, and which it concerned their soul's temporal and eternal welfare to believe in and apply.

Here again we come back from another point to the principle that this long continued and prevailing influence in conserving the truth, this power of maintaining the essentials of "the faith" through all these centuries, with all their complexities and errors, was due chiefly, if not entirely, to the fact that the Eucharist and its performance was always regarded, not as the expression or the ritual of the ministering priest, but as the authoritative voice and action of the Church itself which thus taught alike the priest and people. The minister was there to say what the Church bade him, neither more nor less, to do what its ritual told him, neither less nor more, and the people were there to learn the Church's teaching in what her servant did and said by her command, and to participate in her worship through forms and in the mode she had prepared for him.

Hence, in all ages of the Church, and in every portion of it, Eastern and Western; ancient and mediæval,

Anglican and American, the Liturgy has always been, and has always been regarded, as the *teaching* of the Church in her official and organic character, declaring in its words the doctrine she designed to proclaim, ordaining in its ceremonies what she regarded as the fitting mode of embodying and representing her beliefs.

The principle that the Liturgy should be considered as the voice of the Church so far as to forbid any change by the minister in the *language* of the service is held by many, however, at the present time, who feel no such obligation in regard to the *Rubrics*, and who, accordingly, think themselves authorized to introduce ceremonies and forms into the office as they perform it, which mean, and which they intend to mean, something not already expressed in the appointed order, or not therein conveyed with the fulness and emphasis they deem advisable.

But, in reality, the ceremonies of the Communion office are as definite and influential a part of the teaching work of the Church as the words, and the clergy are no more at liberty to make the Church seem to teach their individual doctrines by alterations in its appointed forms than in its language.

There is no more powerful teacher, nay, in the long run, none so powerful upon the mass of the community as the continued presentation of a series of visible acts to which a definite meaning is attached, and which they are taught always to associate with that meaning. It is a fact which we find repeatedly illustrated in the history of the Church that "The doctrine first creates the practice, and the practice propagates the doctrine."¹

¹ "Doctrine of the Holy Communion," by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, 1885, p. 135.

And the assertion of Canon Trevor is both true and weighty, that "the Church's doctrine and the national settlement arrived at in the Book of Common Prayer may be more vitally affected by variations in the method of celebration (of the Communion) than by an alteration of the prayers themselves" (p. 452).

It is, indeed, this very power¹ of the forms and ceremonies of the Liturgy which is the reason of their appointment by the Church, and which has given them so large a place in the history and controversies of the Church.

Sensible men, and men of piety and learning, do not spend their time and exhaust their energies in contending for or against an ornament or a ceremony merely upon the question of more or less decoration, or the substitution of one gesture for another not quite so elegant. Scholars do not wear out their eyes digging into old forms to find when this usage was first introduced, or that Rubric was changed from its ancient form, as a simple affair of taste in dress, or posture, or pleasant appearance and sound.

The importance which has always been attached to these matters, both by individuals and by the Church itself, is because they were *meant* to *signify thoughts, doctrines, and teachings* concerning some of the most vital relations of the Gospel to man, and because when found, or used in the Liturgy, they were understood and intended to convey the mind of the Church on the subjects of which they had been made the visible expression and the teachers.

¹ Carter, of Clewer, speaking of the parallel changes in the Eucharist and Confessional, p. 49, says: "In both, change of practice preceded change of doctrine, and mainly occasioned it."

Accordingly, the Council of Trent declares (Session XXII, ch. 4.), "On this account has Holy Mother Church instituted certain rites, to wit, that certain things be pronounced in the Mass in a softened, and others in a raised voice. She has likewise made use of ceremonies, such mystic benedictions, lights, fumigations of incense, vestments and many other things of this kind, whereby the majesty of so great a sacrifice might be recommended," etc.

Dr. F. G. Lee, in the *Directorium Anglicanum*, expresses this principle frequently, in fact its application to further the views he desires to propagate is the chief purpose of that extraordinary and pretentious volume; (p. 9): "Ritual and ceremonial are the hieroglyphics of the Catholic religion, a language understood of the faithful, a kind of parable in action;" (p. 16): "Rubrics are the very language of dogma;" (p. 10): "The Communion service is something more than a mere form of prayer—it is an acted sermon;" (p. 17): "Ritual and ceremonial are the expressions of doctrine, and are the safeguards of sacraments," etc.

And Dr. Dix, in his preface to "Treat on the Rubrics," p. 6, says: "Questions of the mode of performing rites and ceremonies, the ornaments of the holy place, and its ministers in all times of their ministrations, their acts, positions and demeanor, are questions of great moment in their proper sphere."

Authorities to any extent might be cited, and from every school of Churchmanship, to the same effect, but the whole history of the ritual of the Church confirms what those above cited declare, and evidences that the ceremonies used in the *Holy Communion teach doctrine*,

were so intended by the Church, and are so understood and so employed by all who intelligently minister or take part in them. Indeed this constitutes one of the fundamental differences between the offices of the Church and the services of the Christian bodies who do not hold to the obligation of a continuance of the historical formulæ of the Church's worship. Our offices are provided for us by the Church, and we are required to minister them as her word and act. The services of the others are only the thought and speech of the individual leader, who speaks and does what seems to himself best suited to the occasion.

The Liturgy is, therefore, in its Rubrics as well as its text, the voice of the "teaching Church." And one of its great purposes is to express continually to her people the doctrines held and taught by *the Church* as *HER authoritative utterance*, in distinction from the diverse, partial and always uncertain deliverances of her individual ministers. As such its words are the precise terms in which she bids her ministers announce her teaching, and the ceremonies, as ordered in the Rubrics, are equally the precise acts by which she has appointed that this same teaching should be visibly expressed.

If each of the clergy may change either the language or the forms of the Communion Office at his own fancy, or to embody his own doctrine, not only will the Liturgy cease to be the accepted and uniform standard of the teachings of the Church, but it will be exceedingly difficult to find where, or to say how, *WE* are any longer a true *ecclesia docens*.

Where else shall we look for it, if every minister

may transform this great office as he please, and make it thus teach whatever he desires?

There is no other office which may not be altered and made in like manner a mere expression of personal opinion, if this can be manipulated in the interest of every school or individual. It has been well said,¹ "The business of a Church is to guard the truth revealed. The Church is the 'the pillar and ground' of that truth. The teaching Church is just as necessary as the Church worshiping," and "we have to ask ourselves whether those who clamor for unlimited toleration have accepted the result that the American Church is to cease being an *ecclesia docens* altogether?"

The English Church, and our Church in America with like reason, has always made its rightful boast and glory that beyond all other Churches she was "a teaching Church," a Church that gave her children everywhere and always, people and ministers alike, the same common teaching conveyed in the same words, embodied in the same ceremonial, and independent equally of the changing impulses of the passing time, and the unauthorized tampering of the individual priest.

Her members have felt that go where they might, however erratic or unsatisfying the sermon of the preacher, they would still have the Church's teaching, and in the services would hear and see her great truths uttered in the words and forms by which she had ordained these should be taught.

¹ By a writer in *The Church Journal* of May 21st, 1874.

This, too, has been regarded as the great safeguard and protection of our laity, and has, time and again, kept congregations staunch and unshaken in the faith when their minister has gone astray from the Church's doctrine, and sought to lead them into Rome, or unbelief, with him.¹

He had, indeed, the sermon as his own, and in that he might insinuate the error he desired to teach, or pervert the truth which he designed to falsify, but the old, calm words, the ever repeated forms he was constrained to use told with unceasing voice the Church's teaching, and told it with a force that soon or late either called him back to the truth again or turned the people from him as a leader whom they could not trust.

Hence, while among other bodies of Christians the spectacle has been not uncommon that a minister would fall away from the true faith and lead his

¹ It is a curious fact, significant of much that might occur if entire liberty of ritual be allowed, that when King's Chapel, in Boston, in 1785, decided to accept the Unitarian theology of its minister in place of its original Episcopal regimen, its first step was to change the Liturgy, and exclude from it all that taught the Trinitarian doctrine.

It may be said that alterations so marked as this would be impossible in a Church so conservative as ours, but the logic of revolutionists is inexorable and defiant, and we shall see further on that omissions equally unjustifiable are already being made. Once let the principle of uncontrolled liberty in the ritual be adopted by our clergy and approved by our laity, and no man can draw the line where individualism and disintegration shall pause.

It is by no means an unknown thing in human history for a faction to tear down barriers that it might gain some advantage over a rival, and then find that the breach has admitted an enemy who has destroyed both.

people, as a whole, with him to error, with us the priest, indeed, has often wandered from the truth and left the Church, but the people, having before their eyes and in their ears continually what the Church did teach, remained with her and he went off alone.

This same universality and uniformity of the teaching by our offices has also been our triumphant answer to the Romanist when he asserted that we were not a "teaching Church." We could reply, and the facts sustained the answer, "There is no Church in Christendom which is so constantly and thoroughly 'a teaching Church' as ours; her formulæ are not locked up in a dead language, nor are her doctrines known only as presented by the individual preacher. They are all given to the people as well as to the minister, the appointed offices teach them at every service, and these are in word and ceremonial, in all that has any doctrinal significance, everywhere the same, and everywhere through them the Church, as the Church teaches with authority what she will have her members, clergy and laity alike, to know and minister as her doctrine."

Upon the other hand, this fixedness and certainty in the teaching of our services, has been one of the mightiest influences in drawing members to our communion from the other Christian bodies in this country, and from the world outside the Christian fold of any name.

The saying has been heard in one form or another by every clergyman of much experience, "In these days when everything is changing and unstable, when men teach one thing to-day and another wholly different

to-morrow, we want a Church that will give us something definite and certain, and which, we know, will teach next year what she has taught the last, and everywhere will meet us with the same unchanging truth set in the same familiar and unchanging forms."

Thus, if our Church is to continue her great mission as a Church, teaching in her organic character and with authority on the high truths entrusted to her keeping, if she is not to be disintegrated into a mere aggregation of ungoverned ministers, each fashioning the worship and doctrine of his service after his own pattern and to suit his own ideas, there must be an acceptance on all hands by all loyal Churchmen of the ancient, universal and Catholic principle that the Liturgy and ritual of the Church are the *voice* and *act* of THE CHURCH, and not of the officiating priest, and as such must "always be ministered" to the people precisely as they are appointed in the Prayer Book.

There are wide ranges of subjects, even in theology, on which this Church has not thought it needful to give any definite expression in her standards; some are not named at all; others are mentioned, but in such terms as to allow the largest liberty of individual opinion; some that were incorporated in her formularies at a former period have been removed and do not constitute an element of her teaching now.

In all these and like cases the clergy as individuals have, and are designed to have, full liberty of personal opinion, and of the expression of that opinion. On all the great questions of scientific investigation, historical inquiry and critical research, on the vexed problems of social economics and political policy, on all these,

which she has left untouched or undecided in her offices and articles, she means that the ministry shall give untrammelled utterance in their preaching and their writings, to the conclusions of their study or the convictions of their reason.

Even on matters where she has spoken, and spoken with the most emphatic utterance, such as the very teachings which are now embodied in the several offices, the language in which they should be conveyed, the ceremonial by which they may best be illustrated and enforced, on all these, as well as the other themes referred to, the clergy and the laity have alike unhindered freedom of discussion, and can employ all the vast means of instruction and of influence which are now at the disposal of every man who cares to use them, to instruct the mind of the community and of the Church, and by the legal modes to have such changes made as their convictions urge them to desire.

The action of our General Convention during the last six years in the revision of the Prayer Book, the changes that have been made, and the questions which are still pending for decision, show most conclusively that a way is open, legal, accessible to all, to propose, and, if the mind of the Church desire it, to make whatever alterations may be needed in any portion of the ceremony, text or teaching of the Church's offices or standards.

Hence, there can be no plea that our services are not the free spontaneous expression of the Church itself, that they have been imposed upon us by "royal injunction" or "by authority of Parliament," or that "we are constrained by the like secular control from shap-

ing them into the form we would if the Church were free."

The members of the "Church in the United States" have the most ample liberty of discussion and of influence upon all matters connected with the shaping of the Church's ordinances, as well as all the living interests of the day. They have, as individuals, abundant means to express their views, and, if possible, persuade the general sentiment of the Church to adopt their opinions, and incorporate these into the authoritative "orders" and formularies in and by which this Church exercises its prerogative as a "teaching Church."

But what they have not the right to do, what no "priest at the altar," in any age or portion of the Church, ever had any authority to do, is to *destroy the authority of the Church as a "teacher"* in any definite and official sense, by changing—each man for himself—the great offices through which she teaches, and making them, by these alterations, mere private vehicles to display the personal opinions of the officiating minister, instead of the established and universal expression of the doctrines of the Gospel, as "this Church hath received the same" and ordained they shall be taught.

And the issue which is really presented on this whole question of "ritual liberty," as now before the American Church, is whether that Church shall continue a "teaching Church," shall have its authorized doctrines presented to all its people and by all its clergy in forms and words of its own appointment; or will it abandon all teaching by authority and surrender

the chief means by which that teaching has always been maintained to the personal convictions or caprices of each and every minister who may have any special fancy or opinion to display.

It may be said, indeed, that there is an implied limitation of the changes thus introduced to usages or doctrines which had been admitted by some portion of the Church in former times, but no one has ever pointed out such limitation, or to what age or section of the Church it should apply; Is it the Sarum use? Why that more than Hereford or York? At no time was any one of these allowed save in the dioceses whose bishop had imposed it as his "use" upon his own clergy. Shall it be the Roman Ordo? That never was admitted as a service of the Church of England, nor would an English priest have ever been allowed to interpolate its forms into the office he was ministering. May we go back still further and gather what seems to us Catholic from the early Church? But every organic portion of the Church in all that very period had its own forms, and cast its teachings in the mould on which all its ministers must shape their services. Each part of the Church then held its clergy, as our Church means we shall be held, to use the offices it gave, and in the mode in which it had appointed them.

Once grant the principle and there is not, there cannot be, any limitation to its application, nor to the doctrines that may be affected by it.

This is evidenced not only by the nature of the case, but also by the facts as they are now actually presented in connection with this subject.

While one faction in the Church claims, as we have just seen, that the importance of certain usages or doctrines from a past age or from a more "Catholic" ritual of the Church justifies those holding these opinions in making such changes in the established offices of "this Church" as will conform these to their views, another party, from precisely the opposite side, think themselves warranted upon authority, at least as high as any ecclesiastical tradition, the teaching of Holy Scripture, to make such other alterations in the words or ceremonial of an offending service as may shape this in accordance with Evangelical theology as they wish it should be taught, or with the spirit of the Gospel as *they* find it in their Bibles; and if both these are free to mould the offices to suit their views upon the plea that there is no obligation, either of law or principle, to hold them to a strict performance of the services as they are set forth, will not a like liberty be asserted by the disciples of the modern schools of materialistic thought and be applied, soon or late, to the demands, which in our day will find an abundant following, that they may remove or modify whatever portions of the appointed order of the Church shall contradict, in their opinion, the demonstrations of natural science, or the prevailing conclusions of the "higher criticism?" Signs are not wanting that these influences are already active and potent in a large number of our clergy, and endeavors to have them recognized in the Church's service would certainly find many among our laity—far more, perhaps, than most of us are aware—ready to welcome them as being in harmony with the spirit of the time.

It would have seemed but a few years ago that there could be no danger of any such intentional tampering with the Liturgy or other public services, as the omission or manipulation of the text of an appointed order for the avowed purpose of teaching a doctrine which was not consistent with that text.

But the logical application of the principle of individual liberty in the performance of the services necessarily involves this among its powers, whenever any doctrinal exigency or personal feeling is strong enough to make the officiating minister think it desirable. And not only is this power implied in the logic of the principle, but we find that it is actually exercised, and that certain integral portions of the Communion office are now deliberately omitted from the chief "celebration" of every Sunday, with the express and expressed intention of teaching a doctrine which cannot be reconciled to the contents of that office as established by "this Church."

In a recent series of Catechetical Tracts¹ issued from a prominent parish in New York, the following positions are maintained:

Q. 'Do I understand you to mean that under the 'forms of bread and wine the priest really offers our 'Lord's body and blood as a sacrifice to God?

A. 'Yes, that is exactly my meaning. The sacrifice 'of the Cross and the sacrifice of the Mass are one and 'the same thing; the offering of our Lord's body and 'blood for the sins of the world, etc.

¹ "Catholic (?) Parish Tracts," No. 1, "What mean ye by this service; or, the Sacrifice of the Mass?" Published by the Young Men's Guild of St. Ignatius' Parish, etc., 1887, pp. 3, 9, 10. It would be difficult to find a really Catholic idea in the entire series.

Q. 'Why did the people in the church not go forward to receive the Communion also ?

A. 'Because they had all had their breakfast, and at our church, according to a very old Christian custom, no one receives Communion unless he is fasting.

Q. 'Why have late Mass at all ? etc.

A. 'Because we believe that the great purpose of having church at all is to offer worship to Almighty God, and as the eleven o'clock service on Sunday will, in the nature of the case, always be THE CHIEF SERVICE OF THE DAY, we think we are bound to have Mass at that time every Sunday.

Q. 'I observe that *certain parts of the service as it stands in the Prayer Book are omitted at this late Mass on Sunday ; why is that ?*

A. 'Because they are parts which refer only to persons in the congregation who are to receive Communion at that service. As there are no such persons, of course the prayers are omitted. They are used, however, at the early Masses at which the people receive.'

It is not necessary to argue here the utter repudiation by the Church in both England and America of the doctrine above set forth, and the practices by which it is there enforced. No one who has the slightest claim to a knowledge¹ and unbiased interpretation of the history of these Churches will venture to question it.

¹ Bishop Harold Browne expresses the historical facts in reference to this matter very clearly and correctly : "Browne on the Articles," p. 744. "From the belief that in the Mass there was a true offering up of Christ, not only for the benefit of the receiver, but anew for the sins of all

The point of importance in the present connection is the evidence these tracts afford that if the claim be allowed, that the clergy may alter the services "as they stand in the Prayer Book," each to suit his own notions, there is no limitation that can prevent their omission, whether from prayers, Scripture-readings, Rubric or Creed, of anything that interferes with the views they maintain, or the addition of anything that may be needed to introduce or to emphasize the opinions they intend to promulgate.

And the practical result will certainly and fatally ensue that "this Church" will cease to be a "Church teaching" with authority by her appointed offices, as she has been wont, but, on the contrary, will find her services transformed and made to express opinions she has not approved, or perverted to enforce the very doctrines they were especially intended to repel and cast out from her communion.

the world, came naturally the custom that the priest should offer the sacrifice, but the people should not communicate. There was, perhaps, nothing against which the reformers were so strong in their denunciations as against this."

Bishop Cosin, certainly not a low type or slight authority on Anglican Theology, speaks of the practice (Parker's "Introduction to the English Revisions," etc., p. 425) as "now *wholly out of use in ALL parishes*," and describes it elsewhere (*ib.*, p. 203), as being in its origin "a lewd and irreligious custom of the people, then nursed up in popery, to be present at the Communion, and let the priest communicate for all, from whence arose the abuses of private Masses, a practice so repugnant to the Scripture and the use of the ancient Church, that at this day not any but the Romish Church throughout all the Christian world are known to use it," etc.

We have already seen, p. 71, note 1, that so intelligent a Romanist as Möhler utterly repudiates the practice.

The issues involved heretofore in these questions of ritual and liturgies have chiefly concerned the expression of opinions which had at one time or another been maintained in some portion of the Church; and the contention has been so violent around the doctrine itself which was at stake, that the Church has almost wholly overlooked the dangers of other and wider applications of the principles of "liturgical unfaithfulness," which were assumed and acted on in the zeal of the contest.

But here, as in all breaking down of fixed safeguards for the purpose of attaining partial and special ends, those who will eventually profit most largely by the destruction of the ancient barriers will not be they in whose interest, and by whose acts, the breach was first made.

There is little probability in the present times that the Church will be dominated too largely by the spirit of the old Evangelical Calvinism, and little more that it will very long be overlaid with the veneered mediævalism of the so-called "advanced" school. Like modern suits of armor and imitated tournaments, this has a certain interest for the time, because of the significance that once attached to it; but there is small chance of its continuance in the tremendous struggles of our age of rifled cannon and agnosticism.

The tide that is setting in upon us, with a fearful peril to the souls of many, is an utter disregard of all positive belief on all religious matters, a repudiation of any definite, authoritative doctrine, and of any necessity that the Church should teach, or require its clergy to conform to anything as its official and obligatory creed.

And if this Church shall once, it matters not in the interest of what party, abandon its character as a "teaching Church," and allow the public services, through which it has so long exercised its high function, to be degraded into the mere mouth-piece of the individual minister, the interest which in the end will profit by this action will be that which virtually denies, or, at best, seeks for an opportunity to ignore, many of the vital principles and fundamental truths of Christian faith and Christian teaching.

The tendency of the thought of our day lies almost wholly in the direction of an entire casting off of all the formulæ and creeds of religion, or, at least, the substitution, practically, of the creed "*I have no fixed belief*," for the established beliefs which have been from the beginning the accepted doctrines of the Christian Church.

Not only is this tendency strong in the minds of vast numbers of the people who are not in the ministry, but there are not a few of our clergy who hold very loosely to many of the doctrines set forth in our offices; and, unless all signs of the times fail, if once the principle of untrammelled "liberty of ritual" be admitted as a valid claim in our Church, the features of its offices, to which this will be most widely and effectively applied, will be just those which stand in the way of the unbelieving criticism and materialistic philosophy that are now so rife all over Christendom, but which, in their spirit, are at war with the very foundations of the Gospel.

I am well aware that the views here expressed will be considered by many as unfounded, excessive, alarm-

ist, without any reason, even as narrow and wholly "behind the times;" but I am also fully convinced that unless the thinking, conservative, Scripture-loving body of the members of the Church shall awaken to something of the same conclusion, and clergy and laity alike shall realize the importance of preserving unimpaired the "teaching Church," we shall, in no long time, be as devoid of the means of fixed, authoritative teaching by the Church as any of the sects. If the influences now at work shall be allowed to dominate, the time is not very distant when the condition of our Church will be, that so many parishes as there are in a community with different "views," so many different liturgies will be performed, and this, so far as any certainty or authority of teaching is concerned, would be to have no *Liturgy of the Church* at all.

I referred above to the interest which the laity had in the preservation of a uniform and established Liturgy as their guide and safeguard for the teaching of the Church.

They have not, indeed, the same responsibility with the clergy as to its use, but they have an equal stake with them in keeping it free from the perversions of individual whim or opinion, and in having it presented to them in its integrity and as established in the Church's standards.

They have a right, one which it is a grievous wrong to violate, to receive from their clergy the truths that are embodied in the Church's authoritative formulæ, and precisely as these are therein declared. They cannot, from the nature of the case, search for themselves into many of the questions concerning doctrine which

are continually raised in connection with their religion, hence they look, and they must trust to the Church as their accepted teacher to present all that is essential for their guidance in these matters, and in the words and forms which it deems best adapted for its teaching.

And the only, or certainly the chief, guarantee the laity of the Church can rely upon to assure them against the perversions of party systems, the unbalanced theories of individualism, or the intrusion of the changing tendencies of each passing age as brought to them, often through the personal opinions of their minister, is to have the truth which *the Church* has approved by her authority and announced in her offices continually presented to them by the performance of these services, precisely in the words and manner which are therein appointed.

Thus, whether we look at the question from the side of clerical obligation or lay rights, of positive law or universal, Catholic principle, of the preservation of the teaching Church, or our influence in the community because of the teaching character which our Church has always heretofore maintained, the requirement comes from all alike that the Prayer Book, accompanied by and compared with the Holy Scriptures, is the standard of the Church's teaching, the law of its services, and the only authorized expression of its accepted doctrine.

In this view of the Prayer Book, the laity have a living share and interest in its proper use as well as the clergy. The services of the book are appointed for the layman as really as for the minister; they are the Church's teaching to the one, and her law and obliga-

tion for the other. The one is to worship according to their forms, the other to minister according to their directions; the one is to look to them as the Church's mind, the other is bound to give this as the Church has ordered it; and for the one as for the other, if "this Church" is to preserve her place and power as "a teaching Church," if she is to be any more than a mere aggregation of individual ministers, each making his own doctrine as if he were himself the Church, there must be an equal submission of all her members, lay and clergy, to the authority by which that teaching is declared, and an equally obedient use of all the means, and in the modes through which that teaching is presented.

The true Evangelical will sustain her power to teach Scriptural truth by his own loving willingness to obey what she has ordered.

The real Catholic will uphold her authority to lead by submitting himself to the laws which it is her Divine function to make and which he has promised to obey.

The self-willed and the blindly partisan will here, as always, sacrifice any interest to his own personal determination, and any obligation to advance the faction which he serves.

